

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

AUG 23 1948

VOLUME XLIII

NUMBER 3

*July 1948*

---

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

---

*A Quarterly Journal* devoted to re-  
search in the Languages, Literatures,  
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

---

THE UNIVERSITY *of* CHICAGO PRESS  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

## EDITORS

JAKOB A. O. LARSEN, *Managing Editor*  
JOHN PHILIP COOKE, *Assistant Editor*

CHARLES HENRY BEESON  
BLANCHE BEATRICE BOYER  
RICHARD TREAT BRUÈRE

CARL DARLING BUCK  
PHILLIP HOWARD DE LACY  
BENEDICT EINARSON  
FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

RICHARD P. McKEON  
RALPH MARCUS  
GERTRUDE SMITH

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

HAROLD F. CHERNISS, *University of California*  
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*  
BEN EDWIN PERRY, *University of Illinois*

RODNEY POTTER ROBINSON, *University of Cincinnati*  
DOM ANSELM STRITTMATTER, *St. Anselm's Priory*  
LILY ROSS TAYLOR, *Bryn Mawr College*

VOL. XLIII

CONTENTS FOR JULY 1948

No. 3

Lysander and the Spartan Empire . . . . .	R. E. Smith	145
Römische Rekrutenausbildung im Lichte der Disziplin . . . . .	Alfred Richard Neumann	157
Euripides' <i>Telephus</i> and the <i>Thesmophoriazusae</i> of Aristophanes	Harold W. Miller	174
Notes and Discussions . . . . .		184
EUGENE S. McCARTNEY: Notes on Reading and Praying Audibly.—J. A. O. LARSEN: "Foreign Judges" in Cicero <i>Ad Atticum</i> vi. 1. 15.—CHARLES H. BEESON: Lupus of Ferrières and Hadoard.		
Book Reviews . . . . .		192
D. S. ROBERTSON (ed.) and PAUL VALETTE (trans.): <i>Apulée: Les Métamorphoses</i> (Perry).—CHARLES ALEXANDER ROBINSON, JR.: <i>Alexander the Great</i> (Griffith).—RUDI THOMSEN: <i>The Italic Regions from Augustus to the Lombard Invasion</i> (McGeachy).—ENZO V. MARMORALE (ed.): <i>Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimachionis</i> (Whittemore).—E. A. THOMPSON: <i>The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus</i> (Laistner).—FRITZ WEHLI (ed.): <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar</i> ; Heft I: <i>Dikaiarchos</i> ; Heft II: <i>Aristoxenos</i> (De Lacy).—ALFRED ERNOUT: <i>Philologica</i> (Whittemore).—PAUL SHANER DUNKIN: <i>Post-Aristophanic Comedy: Studies in the Social Outlook of Middle and New Comedy at Both Athens and Rome</i> (Post).—HARTVIG FRISCH: <i>Cicero's Fight for the Republic: The Historical Background of Cicero's Philippics</i> (Oldfather).—ETTORE PARATORE (ed.): <i>Virgilio Eneide, libro quarto</i> (Pease).—J. SVENNUNG: <i>Compositiones Lucenses</i> (Dillon).—Numismatic Literature, No. 1 (Howe).—ALINE ABAECHERLI BOYCE: <i>Coins of Timgi with Latin Legends</i> (Howe).		

Books Received . . . . .		215
--------------------------	--	-----

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$8.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.75. Orders for service of less than a full year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Republic of Honduras, Mexico, Morocco (Spanish Zone), Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Rio de Oro, El Salvador, Spain (including Balearic Islands, Canary Islands, and the Spanish Offices in Northern Africa; Andorra), Spanish Guinea, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 16 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$8.16), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.79); for all other countries in the Postal Union 40 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$8.40), on single copies, 10 cents (total \$1.85). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following is an authorized agent:

For the British Empire, except North America and Australasia: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor of Classical Philology, Box M, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill. All manuscripts must be typed, double spaced—both texts and notes—with ample margins on firm paper (not onion-skin, etc.).

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter June 20, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917, Section 1103, amended February 28, 1925, authorized June 6, 1918.

3

st  
ne  
so  
sa  
be  
in  
Th  
pu  
de  
er  
ac  
his  
ca  
"o  
bro  
kin  
ma  
Pa  
40  
by  
in  
den

and  
rou  
crit  
inco

Mey  
Coh  
Ehr  
Kah  
Cav

[CLASS]

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XLIII

JULY 1948

Number 3

## LYSANDER AND THE SPARTAN EMPIRE\*

R. E. SMITH

THE importance of the history of the years immediately following the Peloponnesian War for an understanding of Sparta's subsequent downfall needs no elaboration. Unfortunately, our sources for this critical period are far from satisfactory, and much of the story has to be pieced together from stray comments in writers whose virtue was not accuracy. The patient skill of modern scholars has put together a narrative which, while in detail it is open to dispute, has been generally accepted as a reasonably accurate account of the development of Spartan history between 405 and 395 b.c.<sup>1</sup> The critical point in the story so conceived is the "overthrow" of Lysander in 403 b.c., brought about by the opposition of the kings and ephors and having its visible manifestation in his supersession by King Pausanias at Athens in the summer of 403 b.c.<sup>2</sup> Around this affair are grouped, by scholars, a number of incidents which in our sources are dateless; and the evidence thus piled up is used to demonstrate

the overthrow of Lysander and the collapse of his political power. The chief single act of the Spartan state is conceived to be the overthrow of the decarchies, which is dated by almost all modern historians in this period. The object of the present article is to question the rightness of this date and to attempt to define Lysander's part in the history of these years.

The following are the incidents and events which have been collected by historians to form the single affair of Lysander's overthrow: attacks on certain of Lysander's friends; Lysander's disgrace at the hands of Pharnabazus, followed by his visit to Ammon; his supersession by Pausanias at Athens; the overthrow of the decarchies; and, more indefinitely, the failure of his scheme to become king.<sup>3</sup> We may begin with an examination of the attacks on his friends.

The three cases quoted are those of Dercyllidas,<sup>4</sup> Sthenelaus,<sup>5</sup> and Thorax,<sup>6</sup> to which Kahrstedt<sup>7</sup> adds the case of Gylippus.<sup>7</sup> We may take these in turn. Dercyllidas, ἀρμοστής γενόμενος . . . ἐπὶ Λυσάνδρου ναναρχούντος, had been punished at the in-

\* I am deeply indebted to Professor F. E. Adcock and Dr. V. Ehrenberg, both of whom read a very rough draft of this article and made many valuable criticisms and suggestions, most of which have been incorporated.

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, III, Part I, 11 ff.; Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.*, Vol. V, §§ 758 ff.; Glotz and Cohen, *Hist. grecque*, III, 29 f.; Cary, *CAH*, VI, 31 f.; Ehrenberg, P.-W., s.v. "Sparta," cols. 1402-3; Kahrstedt, P.-W., s.v. "Lysandros," col. 2505; Cavaignac, *Rev. ét. hist.*, 1924, pp. 299, 309-10.

<sup>2</sup> I omit the Sestos incident (*Plut. Lys.* 14. 3) because there is absolutely no independent means of dating it.

<sup>3</sup> Xen. *Hell.* iii. 1. 9.

<sup>4</sup> His appointment in Xen. *Hell.* ii. 2; in Diod. xiv. 12. 2 Clearchus is sent out.

<sup>5</sup> Plut. *Lys.* 19. 7. <sup>6</sup> P.-W., col. 2505, l. 41.

<sup>7</sup> Plut. *Lys.* 16. 2 ff.; Diod. xiii. 106. 8 ff.

stigation of Pharnabazus for some offense of which we are not told. Since, however, Lysander's nauarchy fell in the year 408/7,<sup>8</sup> his punishment at this time clearly has no bearing on the supposed attack on Lysander's friends in 403. Sthenelaus was appointed harmost of Chalcedon and Byzantium by Lysander after Aegospotami; in 403 Clearchus was sent out there as *στρατηγός* at the request of the inhabitants. It has therefore been inferred that Clearchus was sent to replace Sthenelaus, who was a friend of Lysander, as part of the political campaign against Lysander. But Sthenelaus had almost certainly been removed before 403, and Clearchus was a fresh appointment to deal with a fresh emergency.<sup>9</sup> Gylippus was prosecuted for embezzling part of the treasure which Lysander sent home to Sparta after Aegospotami. The prosecution occurred when Lysander was still at the height of his power, while Samos was still being besieged; and it is therefore difficult to see how it could represent an indirect attack on Lysander, especially since Gylippus' theft was, in fact, revealed to the ephors through Lysander's scrupulous inclusion of an account. The case of Thorax is thus the only one left which can be adduced as part of an attack on Lysander, and in Plutarch it is quoted as such. But the case of Gylippus should warn us against over-emphasis here; if the authorities could deal thus hardly with Gylippus, we need not wonder that they proceeded against Thorax. But, while we may admit that

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Beloch, *op. cit.*, II, Part II, 288; cf. also Lenschau in P.-W., s.v. "Pharnabazus," col. 1843. Cavaignac (*op. cit.*, p. 297) dates the incident in 403, though he admits that the punishment was inflicted by Lysander.

<sup>9</sup> See Parke, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1930, p. 57. He rightly points out that Byzantium would not have asked for a *στρατηγός* (Diod. xiv. 12. 2) if they already had a *harmost*. He also reasonably supposes that Sthenelaus' appointment was for a definite war objective and that, when this was accomplished, he was recalled; similarly Clearchus was appointed for a particular purpose.

Thorax' execution represented an indirect attack on Lysander, we cannot infer a great deal from an attack on one friend.<sup>10</sup>

Pharnabazus' trick, in giving Lysander a letter ostensibly recommending him but, in fact, accusing him to the Spartan authorities<sup>11</sup> and Lysander's visit to Ammon<sup>12</sup> present a different problem. According to Plutarch, Lysander's return from Pharnabazus, followed by the visit to Ammon, takes place after the installation of the Thirty at Athens<sup>13</sup> and before his subsequent intervention.<sup>14</sup> Diodorus, too, dates the visit to Ammon after Lysander's return from his cruise and before the intervention at Athens, which he describes under the year 401/0.<sup>15</sup> He is silent about Pharnabazus' trick. The following table shows the chronology of these events as suggested by Beloch, by Meyer, and by Lenschau:<sup>16</sup>

#### BELOCH

Early autumn, 403: Pausanias at Athens (III, Part I, 11, n. 3; III, Part II, 210).  
Autumn, 403: Lysander's expedition to Thrace and quarrel with Pharnabazus (III, Part I, 16, n. 1).

Winter, 403/2: Prosecution of Pausanias (III, Part I, 15, n. 4).

#### MEYER

Winter, 404: Lysander's expedition to Thrace (§ 755).  
Summer, 403: Pausanias at Athens (§ 758).  
Autumn, 403: Lysander's (second?) expedition to Thrace, and quarrel with Pharnabazus, dated 403/2 (§ 759).<sup>17</sup>

<sup>10</sup> We cannot be certain that Lysander did, in fact, approve of Thorax' amassing a private fortune. His own contempt of money (cf. Plut. *Lys.* 30. 2) suggests that he would not approve of such a practice; and he may not have been willing to support a friend caught in such circumstances.

<sup>11</sup> Plut. *Lys.* 20. 1 ff.; Polyae. vii. 19; Nepos *Lys.* 4.

<sup>12</sup> Plut. *Lys.* 20. 6 ff., 25. 3 ff.; Diod. xiv. 13; Nepos *Lys.* 3. 2-3; Paus. iii. 18. 3.

<sup>13</sup> Given in chap. 15. Meyer (*op. cit.*, § 755, notes) rightly equates Lysander's expedition, given in chap. 16. 1, with that described by Diodorus (xiv. 10).

<sup>14</sup> Described in chap. 21.

<sup>15</sup> xiv. 33. 6.

<sup>16</sup> S.v. Οἱ Τριάκοντα in P.-W., VI A, 2355-77.

<sup>17</sup> Followed by Cary, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

## LENSCHAU

*ca.* April, 403: Lysander at Athens (col. 2357).  
*ca.* July, 403: Pausanias returns from Athens (col. 2357).  
*ca.* August, 403: Prosecution of Pausanias (col. 2357).

It is clear that there are two difficulties: the first, to find sufficient time for all the events, and the second, so to adjust them that they harmonize with the political situation as it is revealed in Pausanias' intervention at Athens and subsequent acquittal. Beloch, having decided that the change in favor of Pausanias occurred when the ephors for 403/2 took office,<sup>18</sup> dates the intervention in the autumn and the prosecution in the winter. He is then compelled to date Lysander's expedition to Thrace in the autumn, since an earlier date would mean that Lysander had already been disgraced and it would be difficult to explain how he contrived to be sent to Athens. But his dating leaves unanswered the problem of why a hostile ephorate should have sent him to a region where his influence was great, just when they had begun to clip his wings. Meyer (*op. cit.*, § 755)<sup>19</sup> supposed that the ephors for 404/3 also were anti-Lysandrian, but not sufficiently so to keep him wholly inactive. Yet it would be difficult to explain why such a board should have allowed him to proceed both to Thrace and to Athens. And he is faced with a further difficulty: if the Thracian expedition is dated in 404/3, then Pharnabazus' snub cannot

<sup>18</sup> Carried away by this idea, he wrongly says that at Pausanias' trial two of the three ephors voted for his condemnation (p. 15 and n. 4) because Xenophon (*Hell.* II. 4. 29) says that he persuaded three ephors to let him proceed to Athens. Paus. III. 5. 2 clearly states that fourteen of the gerontes and King Agis voted for condemnation, the rest for acquittal (Ehrenberg, *op. cit.*, col. 1402, follows him in this); cf. Cavaignac, *op. cit.*, p. 300 and n. 5; see also Bonner and Smith, *CP*, XXXVII (1942), 118 and n. 23.

<sup>19</sup> Followed by Cary, *op. cit.*, p. 31. Ferguson, however (*CAH*, V, 371), supposes that it was the ephors for 403/2 that were hostile and sent Pausanias to take command at Athens.

have been connected with that expedition, since on his return he would not have been allowed to go to Athens.<sup>20</sup> Meyer therefore has to suppose a second expedition, after his return from Athens, of which our sources say nothing.<sup>21</sup> It is not clear from his account when he would date this expedition with respect to Pausanias' prosecution, though he seems to set the prosecution first. This would increase the difficulties of accepting his chronology, if we were to accept his interpretation of the events as a major clash between two rival policies, in which Lysander was overborne.<sup>22</sup>

With respect to the intervention at Athens, Lenschau's reconstruction appears most satisfactory. Pausanias' prosecution he dates early, merely in order that the trial might be conducted by the ephors of 404/3.<sup>23</sup> It is unnecessary to assume that the ephors for 404/3 must have been consistently hostile to Lysander because

<sup>20</sup> Glotz (*op. cit.*, p. 29) suggests that Lysander toured the empire with Libys in the autumn of 404 and then departed again in the spring of 403 to the Hellespont, where he came into conflict with Pharnabazus. He was recalled and, shamed by Pharnabazus' letter, betook himself to Ammon. How, with this complicated timetable, Lysander ever reached Athens, Glotz does not explain. He then (p. 32) speaks of Lysander at the time of Agis' death (399) as having returned from Ammon and waiting to take his place once more in Spartan politics, for which purpose he schemes to make the monarchy elective. The story of his attempts to bribe the oracles is then given. It is very clear that Glotz has accepted the stories in the sources without making any effort to produce a unified account.

<sup>21</sup> In this he is followed by Cavaignac (*op. cit.*, pp. 300–301).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. *op. cit.*, § 759: "Regierung und Volk hatten erklärt und durch die That erwiesen, dass sie mit ihm nichts gemein hätten und keine Gewalttherrschaft aufrichten, sondern ihr Wort wahr machen wollten"—said with respect to Pausanias' solution of the Athenian problem.

<sup>23</sup> P.-W., VI A, 2357. 28. Both he and Beloch suppose that the two events must be the work of one set of ephors, though they do not agree on which set. In consequence, Lenschau, who supposes it was the ephors of 404/3, sets the trial too early; Beloch, supposing it was those of 403/2, sets the intervention too late. Against Beloch's suggestion, with respect to the permission given to Pausanias to proceed to Athens, see G. Colin, *Xénophon historien* (1933), p. 74 and n. 1.

they were persuaded to allow Pausanias to proceed to Athens or that, because they allowed Lysander to go to Athens, they could not have been responsible for sending Pausanias. There were many political problems confronting Sparta at this time, and Spartans must have been open to persuasion on the best method of handling them. Xenophon (ii. 4. 29) suggests that Pausanias had to win over a majority of the ephors: *πείσας τῶν ἑφόρων τρέῖς*. At the trial all five ephors were on his side,<sup>24</sup> and this suggests a growing realization on the part of certain Spartans that Lysander's policy had implications distasteful to themselves.<sup>25</sup> Before we attempt to suggest a date for the other incidents, it will be best to examine the traditions as reflected in the sources. Χ

Ephorus' version of the reason for the visit to Ammon presents great difficulties. According to him, the visit was part of a deeply planned scheme by Lysander for possessing himself of the kingship at Sparta by bribing the oracle to state that the kingship should be open to all Spartiates. In general, the suggestion that Lysander had large sums of money with which to bribe the oracles<sup>26</sup> conflicts directly with Theopompus' statement about his poverty,<sup>27</sup> and this is borne out by the story of his daughters' plight after his death.<sup>28</sup> Further, he is supposed to have been put on trial and acquitted of the charge of bribery brought by the emissaries of the priests of Ammon;<sup>29</sup> it seems very unlikely that, if Lysander had made all the arrangements with which he is credited, including the discovery of someone to play the part of Apollo's son, not a

breath of this should have come out at the trial<sup>30</sup> and that the attendants should have accused him of attempts to bribe the oracle, without stating the cause for which the bribes were offered. One may reasonably ask how, if none of this came out until after his death, Ephorus was able to give so detailed an account of the whole affair;<sup>31</sup> for Lysander would not have left a careful account of his failure among his papers and what, therefore, had been kept secret for so long would have remained so for all time. The story of how it is supposed to have come to light is equally difficult to accept; according to Ephorus, *χρόνῳ δ' ὕστερον . . . ἀντιλογίας τινὸς συμμαχικῆς ἐν Σπάρτη γενομένης καὶ τὰ γράμματα διασκέψασθαι δεῆσαν, ἢ παρ' ἑαυτῷ κατέσχεν δ' Λίσανδρος κ.τ.λ.*<sup>32</sup> One is not disposed to believe that official papers were kept by private individuals; and, even if Lysander did for some reason have charge of them, they would surely have been handed over to the state on his death and not left to be destroyed perhaps by his heirs and only called for when a difference arose.<sup>33</sup>

The date of the affair, according to Ephorus, is as obscure as all else. Nepos

<sup>24</sup> The unlikelihood is increased when one remembers that his unsuccessful efforts at Dodona were made through an intermediary (Plut. *Lys.* 25. 3; Diod. xiv. 13. 4), to whom he must have revealed the whole design; the number of persons privy to his schemes from this cause alone must have militated against absolute secrecy over many years. We may add further that the intermediary was from Apollonia on the Illyrian coast (Diod. xiv. 13. 4), a rather unlikely place to find an intermediary.

<sup>25</sup> Detailed to the extent of knowing the agent employed to bribe the oracle at Dodona.

<sup>26</sup> Plut. *Lys.* 30. 3; cf. also *Moral.* 229 f.

<sup>27</sup> It should be noted that only his speech, composed by a certain Cleon of Halicarnassus, which Lysander had intended to deliver before the people, was discovered then. How all the other details came to light is not told us. It is interesting to observe that, according to Ephorus' story, the Spartans continued to trust Lysander until after his death; the implication is that he did not fall out of favor because they did not appreciate his intentions; and this fact hardly supports the theory of his "overthrow."

<sup>24</sup> See above, n. 18.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Cavaignac, *op. cit.*, p. 300.

<sup>26</sup> Diod. xiv. 13. 4-5; Plut. *Lys.* 25. 3; Nepos (*Lys.* 3. 2, 3) uses the verb *corrumpere*.

<sup>27</sup> Plut. *Lys.* 30. 2; cf. 2. 6; Athen. xii. 543b, c.

<sup>28</sup> Plut. *Lys.* 30. 6; *Moral.* 230a.

<sup>29</sup> Diod. xiv. 13. 7; Plut. *Lys.* 25. 4.

sets it immediately before Haliartus,<sup>34</sup> Diodorus in 403.<sup>35</sup> Plutarch has both dates. In *Lys.* 20. 6. ff. he narrates the visit to Ammon immediately after the return from Pharnabazus and gives variant accounts of the reason for it; after which he adds: *ἥν μὲν γὰρ Ἐφόρος τῆς ἀποδημίας ταῦτα αἰρίαν ἀναγράφει, μετὰ μικρὸν ἀφηγήσομαι.* The story is then given (25. 3 ff.) after Lysander's return from Asia Minor, when he is supposed to have been so angered by his treatment at Agesilaus' hands that he determined to overthrow the kingship. That this is not a silly mistake on Plutarch's part is proved by two corroborative passages in the *Agesilaus*,<sup>36</sup> which show that Plutarch had reason to believe that Lysander's plot against the kings belonged to this time. The reason for this divergence seems clear; Ephorus, not surprisingly, did not give a clear date to his elaborate story, beyond some general phrase, such as "on his return from Asia." This could refer to either time and was taken differently by different persons who used his history. Diodorus inserted it after his return in 403; Plutarch's source for chapter 20 of the *Lysander* referred to Lysander's visit to Ammon and gave two variant reasons, to which Plutarch added a third, Ephorus', of which he was independently aware. He then introduced the full story in 24. 4 ff. because it was then that his source for that chapter, who gave Ephorus' version,<sup>37</sup> mentioned it. Similarly, Nepos followed a source which dated it in 395.<sup>38</sup>

With respect to the story of Pharnabazus' trick, we find a similar situation. In Polyaenus, whose source must have

<sup>34</sup> *Lys.* 3. 3-4.    <sup>35</sup> *xiv.* 13. 5.    <sup>36</sup> 8. 4 and 20. 3.

<sup>37</sup> Not but that Plutarch himself probably consulted Ephorus.

<sup>38</sup> I am tempted to believe that the source was a biography, used by both Plutarch and Nepos; but Plutarch, as usual, used much else, including a source which gave the alternative dating.

been the same as Plutarch's,<sup>39</sup> there is no hint of the circumstances or time of the incident. Nepos, however, has tried to relate it to the career of Lysander, and his attempt to do so is instructive. He says: "Nam cum Lysander *praefectus classis in bello* multa crudeliter avaraque fecisset . . . petiit a Pharnabazo ut . . . testimonium daret, quanta sanctitate *bellum gessisset sociosque tractasset* . . ." Even if we allow for looseness of phraseology in describing Lysander as *praefectus classis*, yet it is clear that *bellum* can be applied only to the Peloponnesian War; and it can hardly be construed to represent the same situation as that depicted by Plutarch (19. 7), who says: *ἐπει δὲ Φαρνάβαζος, ἀδικούμενος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τὴν χώραν ἀγοντος καὶ φέροντος κ.τ.λ.* We seem again to be confronted by a timeless story, to which Nepos and Plutarch have tried to give a setting. In Nepos the story is outside the main narrative; Nepos knew the story, wished to introduce it as an illustrative anecdote, and gave it the background he thought appropriate. Plutarch's source probably mentioned a complaint by Pharnabazus at this time; Plutarch decided that this was a good place to insert the story of the deception, for which he had no more appropriate place. The story seems to be apocryphal and cannot be used as evidence of Lysander's discomfiture at this time.<sup>40</sup> On this hypothesis we are left with a mention of a complaint by Pharnabazus,<sup>41</sup> which may or may not have been taken seriously

<sup>39</sup> The narratives agree almost word for word.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Prentice, *AJA*, XXXVIII (1934), 37 ff., who disbelieves the story, but does not go into details. I think that he is right and that the story probably originated from Ephorus' fertile mind; it is to him that most of the anti-Lysandrian stories are due (cf. Meyer, *Theopomps Hellenika*, p. 82, n. 4).

<sup>41</sup> That Pharnabazus should have sought an opportunity to complain about Lysander is natural, in view of Lysander's part in procuring Alcibiades' death (*Plut. Alc.* 38. 5 ff.; *Isoc.* xvi. 40). See Hatzfeld, *Alcibiade* (1940), pp. 340 ff.; Lenschau (P.-W., VI A, 2359-60) dates this July/August, 404.

at Sparta, followed by a visit to Ammon.<sup>42</sup> If these are placed after Lysander's intervention at Athens, there is the difficulty that Cyrus had returned to Asia Minor in the summer of 403,<sup>43</sup> and, even if Pharnabazus made a complaint about Lysander's behavior, Lysander could have used Cyrus to re-establish his reputation at home.<sup>44</sup> It is, further, not clear in what capacity he would have undertaken an expedition; Libys' nauarchy would have terminated *ca.* September, 403, and we should have to assume that Lysander was once more *epistoleus*.<sup>45</sup> It is far more reasonable to date it in the autumn and winter months of 404/3, between his return from Samos and his departure for Athens in the spring of 403,<sup>46</sup> while his brother was

<sup>42</sup> I am deliberately giving Plutarch the benefit of the doubt in this matter. He has a habit—for the historian, unfortunate—of turning from one incident to another sometimes considerably later in the life of his character and joining the two by some general sentence or reflection in order to give the illusion of continuity. These sentences are highly suspect, though frequently mistaken for history. Unfortunately, both the Pharnabazus incident (19. 7) and the visit to Ammon (20. 6) are so introduced; and, while in the absence of other evidence it would be unscientific to reject them for that reason, yet my suspicions are raised. I confess that with respect to the Ammon incident the *ἥμερας ὀλύγων* is more specific than is his wont (cf. 21. 7, *ὅτικώς δὲ τοτέπον*—about six years—for the normal type of phrase), but he is sometimes perversely and unreasonably specific (see, e.g., 15. 6, *εἰδὼς*, with respect to the installation of Callibius). The visit to Ammon may well have had political implications, since Egypt had just revolted from Persia, and, in Cyrus' interests, this would have been worth encouraging.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.*, § 832; Cavalignac (*op. cit.*, p. 312) dates this in 404.

<sup>44</sup> An office which Cyrus would have been particularly happy to undertake, in view of his need of Greek help for his great project.

<sup>45</sup> In which case it would hardly be argued that he was out of favor. Beloch (*op. cit.*, II, Part II, 289) does not show him as *epistoleus* for 404/3, since our sources nowhere speak of him as such. Yet it is difficult to know on what other authority he commanded the fleet during this year.

<sup>46</sup> Hatzfeld (*op. cit.*, p. 341, n. 1) states that Lysander's movements can, within limits, be traced from the capitulation of Samos, *τελευτῶν τοῦ θερεπον* (*Hell. II. 3. 8* [concerning this phrase see Beloch, *op. cit.*, III, Part II, 208]); in the winter he was at Sparta when the Thirty asked for a garrison (*Hell. II. 3. 14*) and again in the spring, when he ar-

nauarch.<sup>47</sup> This chronology, which alone does no violence to the evidence, carries with it the conclusion that his disgrace as a result of Pharnabazus' complaint was, at the worst, short-lived, since his influence was undiminished when the Thirty asked for help and at Lysander's instigation received it. ¶

There is left the overthrow of the decarchies, a fact which is attested by our authorities but for which they suggest no date.<sup>48</sup> Both Xenophon and Plutarch are speaking specifically of the decarchies in Asia Minor,<sup>49</sup> and with them we may best

ranged for a loan of 100 talents (*Hell. II. 4. 28*). He therefore denies that the expedition could have taken place during these months. In the first place, it is doubtful whether the request of the Thirty can be dated so late; Lenschau (P.-W., VI A, 2366) dates it *ca.* July, 404; and, even if this seems unduly early, he shows very good reason for dating it well before the winter. He further points out (col. 2359), that Lysander might not have been present at Sparta at the time but could have carried through the negotiations by intermediary. But if Hatzfeld does date the request in the winter, he cannot surely hope to fit in all the events between them and Lysander's intervention between winter and spring. Colin (*op. cit.*), whose scheme of dating places events much later than does Lenschau's and in certain details is open to criticism, also dates (pp. 61, 114) the request in January/February, 403, and Lysander's intervention (pp. 70, 114) in June, thus leaving five to six months between the two events; and that is the very minimum. Cavalignac (*op. cit.*, p. 296) would date the expedition in the spring of 403, after the installation of Callibius and before Lysander's intervention in the early summer.

<sup>47</sup> This dating has the advantage—for what it is worth—of corresponding with Plutarch's chronology, by putting it after Lysander's departure from Athens (and the installation of Callibius, which Plutarch has telescoped into a single operation with the surrender) and before his return there as harmost, together with his brother, Libys. It would also give a meaning to *στρατηγῶν ἴτα Θώρακα* (*Plut. Lys. 19. 7*), for Thorax would at that time have been a very recent fellow-campaigner; it would, however, reduce to a very short tenure his harmostship of Samos. Diodorus has the same order of events but, unfortunately, dates the intervention at Athens in 401/0 (xiv. 33. 6), and so he is best left out of account. Though I believe Lenschau's dating to be nearest to the truth, for my immediate purposes the important point is that I believe the expedition to have taken place between these two events, whenever exactly they are dated.

<sup>48</sup> For Sparta's empire and the decarchies in general Parke, *op. cit.*, pp. 37 ff., is basic. The evidence is to be found in *Hell. III. 4. 2. 7*; *Plut. Ages. 6. 2*; Nepos *Lys. 3. 1*.

<sup>49</sup> I shall discuss Nepos later (see below, n. 69).

begin. They were installed by Lysander during 405/4 and were presumably unsupported by harmosts and garrisons.<sup>50</sup> We get a glimpse of them in 403 on Cyrus' return to Asia Minor, when we find<sup>51</sup> that Cyrus had garrisons in the Ionian cities, all of which, with the exception of Miletus, had revolted to him. Miletus had been contemplating revolt but had been forestalled by Tissaphernes, who slew or banished his opponents. The fugitives fled to Cyrus. These fugitives, it is agreed, represented Lysander's oligarchy—or supporters of a decarchy, if there was one.<sup>52</sup> The inference is that the governments of the cities were pro-Cyrus and, since the other cities forestalled Tissaphernes, were still enjoying at the time of their revolt an oligarchic government similar to that banished by Tissaphernes at Miletus; for, if the Spartans had proclaimed the restoration of *πάτριοι πολιτεῖαι*, presumably Miletus would also have been involved in the change.<sup>53</sup> In view of the close collaboration between Lysander and Cyrus, it is

<sup>50</sup> See Parke, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

<sup>51</sup> Xen. *Anab.* I. 1. 6–7.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.*, § 701, n.; Beloch, *op. cit.*, III, Part I, 30.

<sup>53</sup> Since the supersession of Lysander by Pausanias is generally considered to have been the first step in the overthrow of Lysander (cf. Parke, *op. cit.*, p. 53), it is difficult to see how in any case a flat from Sparta concerning the decarchies could have been operative in Asia, since Cyrus' return corresponded with Pausanias' intervention at Athens. Meyer (*Theopomps Hellenika*, pp. 112 ff.) gives a similar account of the Ionian cities and concludes (p. 114) as follows: "Lysanders Organe und seine Dekarchen waren im spartanischen Machtbereich überall gestürzt; so erklärt es sich, dass sie jetzt auch in Asien gerade unter der spartanischen Herrschaft verschwinden und einer gemässigten Aristokratie Platz machen [referring to 400/399]." It is clear that Meyer had reconsidered the problem of these cities since writing his *Gesch. d. Alt.* and saw the impossibility of the suggestion that these decarchies fell at the time of Lysander's *Sturz*. But he continued to believe in a *Sturz ca. 403/2*, failing to realize that his basic evidence for it consisted in the passage of Xenophon which speaks of the overthrow of the decarchies. The passage refers specifically to these cities, and to them, if to no others, it must be wholly applicable. The further problem of Lysander's proved influence at the time he suggests (399) is not considered.

natural that these governments should have turned to Cyrus; they would have been chosen, in the first place, as being satisfactory to him as well as to Lysander and were probably encouraged by Lysander to behave as they did.<sup>54</sup>

Nothing further is heard of them until 400, when Tissaphernes returned to Ionia with enhanced powers and demanded the submission of the Ionian cities to himself,<sup>55</sup> a demand so distasteful to the cities that they appealed to Sparta for help. Sparta responded by sending a deputation to Tissaphernes<sup>56</sup> and, when this was ignored, by sending Thibron.<sup>57</sup> If Sparta had not interfered with their government before Cyrus' return, it is impossible that she should have interfered after that date; hence the governments that appealed to Sparta in 400 would be those that had turned to Cyrus in 403,<sup>58</sup> which were those installed by Lysander.

With the details of Thibron's and Dercyllidas' campaigns we are not concerned, except for the supersession and banishment of Thibron, to which we shall return later.<sup>59</sup> But, when Sparta decided to embark on a full-scale war, Lysander was very anxious for Agesilaus to be given the command, because he hoped to accompany him and restore the decarchies and oligarchies which had been overthrown. The conditions in Asia at this moment have to be inferred from sources not primarily concerned with their description.

<sup>54</sup> For the continued collaboration between Sparta (probably Lysander) and Cyrus, cf. Diod. xiv. 11. 2 (probably an exaggeration), 19. 4–5, 21. 1; Hell. iii. 1. 1; cf. also Judeich, *Kleinasiatische Studien*, p. 36.

<sup>55</sup> Hell. iii. 1. 3; Diod. xiv. 35. 6.

<sup>56</sup> Diod. xiv. 35. 6.

<sup>57</sup> Hell. iii. 1. 4; Diod. xiv. 36. 1.

<sup>58</sup> Any change which they might have undergone would have been due to the Persians, not to Sparta; but the readiness with which Sparta heard their appeal strongly suggests that the governments were still *personae gratae* at Sparta.

<sup>59</sup> See below, p. 154.

Plutarch's statement<sup>60</sup> is quite clear that at this moment, i.e., 397, the upheaval was taking place (*ἐξέπιπτον, ἀπέθνησκον*) and that this was the reason for Lysander's anxiety to return there. Confusion in the cities at this moment is spoken of by Xenophon,<sup>61</sup> and it is further stated to have been caused by the disappearance of the decarchies. It seems quite incredible that this confusion should still exist, if the decarchies had, in fact, been abolished *ca.* 403, i.e., about seven years previously,<sup>62</sup> especially when it is remembered that Cyrus had installed Persian garrisons and that had there been any trouble it would have been dealt with at that time. Moreover, any such suggestion conflicts with the evidence of conditions in Asia on Dercyllidas' arrival in 398. Xenophon<sup>63</sup> on that occasion states that all was well with the cities, and Xenophon could not have spoken thus with respect to affairs in 398 if, in fact, the conditions were as unsettled as he describes them in 397/6. It is but reasonable to suppose that between these two dates something intervened which brought about the change implied in these statements; and there is, in fact, an event which might well have been the cause of the change. Xenophon<sup>64</sup> describes a truce arranged between Dercyllidas, on the one hand, and Pharnabazus and Tissaphernes, on the other, in the year 397. Dercyllidas stipulated for the independence of the Greek cities, the Persians for the removal of the Spartan army and the harmosts from the cities. Both sides referred the

<sup>60</sup> *Ages.* 6. 2: ὁ δὲ Λύσανδρος ἐπιθυμῶν . . . βοηθεῖσαι τοὺς φίλοις, οὓς αὐτὸς μὲν ἀρχοντας καὶ κυρίους τῶν πόλεων ἀπέλιπε, καλώς δὲ χρόμενοι καὶ βασιοῦ τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐξέτιστον ὅπό τὸν πολιτῶν καὶ ἀπεθηκον κ.τ.λ.

<sup>61</sup> *Hell.* III. 4. 7.

<sup>62</sup> Or, on Meyer's second hypothesis (see n. 53), about three to four years previously, since he assumes that an orderly government was installed in their place.

<sup>63</sup> *Hell.* III. 2. 11: ἐπισκοπῶν τὰς πόλεις ἔώρα τὰ μὲν ἀλλα καλῶς ἔχοντας, Χιων δὲ φυγάδας κ.τ.λ.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.* 2. 19 f.

conditions to their home governments, and nothing more is heard of the incident. It is generally assumed that the negotiations were abortive,<sup>65</sup> but for this we have no direct evidence. There was a body of opinion in Sparta to whom such a withdrawal would have been not unwelcome,<sup>66</sup> while the King of Persia himself, later on, made a similar suggestion about the autonomy of the cities, with the proviso that they should continue to pay tribute.<sup>67</sup> If Sparta did withdraw her harmosts, thus leaving the cities exposed to Persia, the pro-Spartan governments would have been removed in favor of others more friendly to Persia, with the result that by 396 there would be confusion and upheaval. And, even if the treaty was, in fact, not ratified, Sparta could still have taken the first steps toward fulfilling her side of the bargain, especially if there were at that moment men in power at Sparta who had no wish for an overseas empire.<sup>68</sup> By assuming such an order of events, we can explain how it came about that Lysander was so anxious to accompany Agesilaus in 396, though he had made no effort to go to Asia Minor before; and we are saved from the embarrassment of having to suppose that these cities had been in turmoil since *ca.* 403, although the evidence makes such a supposition very hard.<sup>69</sup>

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Beloch, *op. cit.*, III, Part I, 39; Cary, *op. cit.*, pp. 39–40; Parke, *op. cit.*, p. 66, n. 60.

<sup>66</sup> See below, pp. 155 f.

<sup>67</sup> *Hell.* III. 4. 25–26.

<sup>68</sup> Those who would not admit the removal of harmosts (presumably installed by Dercyllidas) on this occasion are left to explain the subsequent upheaval if, in fact, there were Spartan harmosts and garrisons in the cities.

<sup>69</sup> Busolt and Swoboda (*Gr. Staatsk.*, p. 1325 and n. 5) have suggested this date—397—for the overthrow of the decarchies and have collected most of the evidence adduced above in its support. The evidence of Nepos, except to confirm the fact that decarchies were abolished, is worth little, because there is an unfortunate lacuna at a critical point in the text. But, for what it is worth, it seems to support the later date. Working back from Haliartus (3. 4), we find that he

There is a further consideration which arises out of this interpretation of events, namely, which decarchies were involved in the ephors' decree. Xenophon and Plutarch are both speaking specifically of those in Asia Minor; and, on the present interpretation, the ephors' decree would have been concerned primarily, if not exclusively, with that area and would have been made in deference to Persia. The Boeotians in a speech at Athens in 395 are made by Xenophon<sup>70</sup> to say of Sparta's allies: *ὑπό τε γὰρ τῶν ἀρμοστῶν τυραννοῦνται καὶ ὑπὸ δέκα ἀνδρῶν*. This statement is generally dismissed as a distortion designed to put the Spartan empire in an unfavorable light, because the decarchies had already, according to the historians, been removed many years before. But, with the later dating, the difficulty is largely removed; in the first place, it is not certain that the decree covered the whole Spartan empire, and it is quite possible that decarchies were left in some cities not in Asia Minor; and, even if the decree was intended to be universal, there might still be in 395 some cities in which the decree had not yet been enforced. But it is very difficult to believe that a system of government, which had a fleeting existence of about two years, should still be referred to nearly seven years later in the present tense—even for purposes of rhetorical distortion.

An examination of the evidence, therefore, does not support the hypothesis of a grand political defeat for Lysander in 403, from which he never recovered. A brief survey of Lysander's history between 403 and 396 will serve to confirm this conclu-

sion.<sup>71</sup> His primacy in 405 was such that, once the demands of war made it possible, he was bound to arouse opposition from men in Sparta who could not look with indifference on such concentrated power, whose growth they had been forced to allow in the crisis of the war but which was contrary to the traditions of Sparta. One of his bitterest opponents was King Pausanias, whether influenced by personal jealousy<sup>72</sup> or by opposition to Lysander's policy is not clear; but probably it was a combination of the two. Pausanias had to use persuasion with the ephors to be allowed to succeed Lysander,<sup>73</sup> to whom it represented the first demonstration that, since the war was over, he could not continue to exercise the powers of a war-leader. The trial of Pausanias, which followed, showed that by no means all at Sparta agreed with Pausanias, and among his opponents was his fellow-king, Agis.<sup>74</sup> It was nonetheless a political defeat for Lysander and may be taken to mark the end of a period in his career. Pausanias' victory, however, was short-lived, for, when the Elean war broke out, it was not Pausanias but Lysander's ally, Agis, who took command. Of Lysander himself we hear

<sup>70</sup> This very brief summary, of necessity, omits mention of many things which a history of Sparta would demand: the social and economic consequences of the war, resulting in Kinadon's conspiracy; the controversy concerning the constitution; Sparta's policy with respect to the League; etc. The summary is concerned only with Lysander's part and place in the events.

<sup>71</sup> All our sources in speaking of Pausanias' intervention at Athens refer to his envy of Lysander (*Hell. II. 4. 29*; *Plut. Lys. 21. 4*; *Diod. xiv. 33. 6*).

<sup>72</sup> *Hell. II. 4. 29*; cf. above, p. 147.

<sup>73</sup> It is significant that Agis, who had had an almost independent command at Decelea during the war, supported Lysander. Collin (*op. cit.*, p. 74), depending on Plutarch's loose phraseology (*Lys. 21. 4*; *οἱ δὲ βασιλεῖς*), states that Agis was opposed to Lysander's ambitious plans. He seems to forget Agis' vote for Pausanias' condemnation. Lysander seems also to have had Naukleidas prosecuted, the ephor who accompanied Pausanias and supported his policy (cf. *Hell. II. 4. 35-36*; *Athen. xii. 550d, e*). See P. Poralla, *Prosopographie der Lakedaimonier* (Breslau, 1913), No. 548.

went on that campaign after being acquitted, on his return from Ammon, of having bribed the oracle and that the immediate cause of his visit to Ammon was his anger at the overthrow of the decarchies. If this scheme of causality means anything, we can hardly date the overthrow in 403/2.

<sup>70</sup> *Hell. III. 5. 13*.

nothing, though it is probable that at this time should be dated his embassy to Dionysius of Syracuse,<sup>75</sup> an embassy not without importance, in view of the value which Sparta attached to good relations with Syracuse. Sparta, meanwhile, was committing herself to limited aid to Cyrus' great enterprise; and it would be unreasonable to deny that the details of the negotiations, if not the actual inspiration to help, were the work of Lysander, Cyrus' trusted Spartan friend.<sup>76</sup> Pausanias and his friends would not have urged co-operation with the man who, above all others, had helped to make Lysander great, and that in an enterprise which, if successful, would only have embarrassed themselves at home; for, with Cyrus as the great king, Lysander's influence must have been once more paramount in Greece, and this consequence Pausanias could have well foreseen. The ready co-operation of the cities of Asia and of Sparta with Cyrus represents a victory for Lysander and shows that he still exercised influence over Spartan policy.

In 399, the year of Agesilaus' succession,<sup>77</sup> we find that Lysander's influence at Sparta was such that he was able to win the throne for his friend. On this fact our sources are agreed.<sup>78</sup> The exact political implications of this struggle for the

<sup>75</sup> Plut. *Lys.* 2. 7; cf. Poralla, *op. cit.*, No. 504. In Plutarch the embassy followed. *δώλιον ὑπέρερον*, a gift sent by Dionysius to Lysander. If one could trust the phrase, it would suggest that Lysander was still a man worth courting; but, unfortunately, it is one of Plutarch's stock phrases for joining two incidents, and no emphasis can be laid on it. The date of the embassy can hardly be before mid-403, since we can account for Lysander's movements almost without a break until then. Cavaignac (*op. cit.*, p. 315) dates this in 399/8.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Judeich, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

<sup>77</sup> For the date see Poralla (*op. cit.*, p. 160), who collects the suggested alternatives; to which may be added Hatzfeld, *Rev. ét. anc.*, 1933, p. 397.

<sup>78</sup> Plut. *Lys.* 22. 6 ff.; *Ages.* 3; *Hell.* iii. 3. 1-3; Paus. iii. 8. 7-10; Nepos *Ages.* 1. Pausanias even comments that they did not refer the dispute to Delphi, owing to the zeal with which Lysander urged his case.

kingship we shall never know, but that politics eventually, if not at first, entered into it is clear.<sup>79</sup> In this same year Dercyllidas superseded Thibron as harmost in Asia; and, since Lysander's power is proved by his successful support of Agesilaus, one may reasonably inquire why, if he was so anxious to go to Asia to restore the decarchies in 396, he was not equally anxious at this moment if the decarchies had already been abolished. On the hypothesis that they were still in existence, however, his behavior at this moment is explicable; he was keeping an eye on affairs in Asia but preferred himself to remain in Sparta, in order to direct Spartan policy, which, were he to absent himself, might be reversed by his opponents. We do not know why Thibron was removed from the command and banished,<sup>80</sup> but Xenophon<sup>81</sup> tells us: *κατηγόρουν γὰρ αὐτὸν οἱ σύμμαχοι ως ἐφείν ἀρπάζειν τῷ στρατεύματι τοὺς φίλους*. This suggests that those friends of Lysander who had appealed to Sparta in 400 and were to appeal again in 397, on both occasions with success, had complained to Sparta about Thibron's behavior and that Lysander had contrived to have him removed from the command and replaced by Dercyl-

<sup>79</sup> See Louria, *Klio*, 1927, pp. 404 ff. Hatzfeld (*Alcibiade*, p. 218, n. 3) does not accept Louria's hypothesis that Leotychidas was friendly with Pausanias and that, since agreement between the kings was fatal to the ephorate, the ephors trumped up the charge of illegitimacy. Whether this hypothesis is right we cannot say, but it must be admitted that the charge of illegitimacy could be a political weapon at Sparta, and on occasion was. Hatzfeld does not attempt to answer a cogent objection of Louria's to Alcibiades' suspected paternity, namely, the age of Leotychidas at the time of the succession. He himself dates the earthquake 413/2 winter (p. 217); in that case Leotychidas would be only about twelve years old at this time, and a twelve-year-old could not have played the part for which Leotychidas is cast in the story. I confess that I suspect political intrigue. For the story of the illegitimacy, cf. Ehrenberg, P.-W., s.v. "Timaia."

<sup>80</sup> See Ehrenberg, P.-W., s.v. "Thibron," col. 274; he suggests political reasons but points out that we cannot know the inner story of Spartan politics at this time (cf. Judeich, *op. cit.*, p. 44).

<sup>81</sup> *Hell.* iii. 1. 8; cf. Diod. xiv. 38. 2.

lidias, who seems to have been one of Lysander's supporters;<sup>82</sup> he had fought with him and been appointed harmost of Abydos by him; and, from what we know of his character, the opportunities overseas which Lysander's policy provided were likely to appeal to him.<sup>83</sup> By the dispatch of Dercyllidas, therefore, Lysander might hope to be able, within limits, to control Asian affairs.

In 397 it appears that he suffered a setback, for on our hypothesis the government agreed to withdraw its harmosts from Asia. This would represent the temporary ascendancy of Pausanias and his friends, as a result of which they set about implementing their policy. On this occasion their actions<sup>84</sup> probably represented a first step in the abandonment of the empire in favor of the traditional Peloponnesian policy. And when the report of vast naval preparations by Persia compelled Sparta to resume the war on a larger scale, there are indications that the struggle for the command was keen. Lysander wanted Agesilaus to be chosen and for that purpose wrote to his friends in Asia asking them to request Agesilaus.<sup>85</sup> Yet it appears that, even so, Agesilaus had to fight for the command. There is a story in Plutarch<sup>86</sup> that Agesilaus consulted the oracle at Dodona on the question of his leadership in Asia and, receiving a favorable answer, reported it to the ephors. They, however, ordered him to consult Delphi, and

<sup>82</sup> Those who would see in his punishment at an earlier date an indirect attack on Lysander would have to admit that his appointment at this time represents a victory for Lysander (cf. Judeich, *op. cit.*, p. 44, n. 3, and p. 45).

<sup>83</sup> Cf. *Hell.* iv. 3. 2: *καὶ γάρ ἀεὶ φιλαπόδημος ἦν.*

<sup>84</sup> See above, p. 152.

<sup>85</sup> Who these friends could be, on the traditional hypothesis, is not clear. But if we suppose them to have been the governments, recently removed by Tissaphernes after the withdrawal of the harmosts, then it is understandable that Sparta was prepared to listen to them.

<sup>86</sup> *Moral.* 208f; cf. 191b.

only by his shrewd posing of the question did he obtain a favorable reply.<sup>87</sup> The implication of this seems clear: in the struggle between Lysander and Pausanias, Lysander had succeeded to the extent that Agesilaus had been named as the commander; Pausanias made a final bid to oust Agesilaus by requiring him on some pretext to win divine approval.<sup>88</sup> When this, too, failed, he had no alternative but to allow Agesilaus to command.

With Lysander's career in Asia and afterward we need spend no time. His influence on his return seems to have been hardly—if any—less than before. According to Plutarch,<sup>89</sup> he played a leading part in urging the war against Thebes and was himself chosen as one of the commanders.

<sup>87</sup> Justin (vi. 2, 4 ff.) has a garbled version of this. He speaks of an oracle at this time but then confuses it with the oracle given at the time of succession. But he clearly refers to an oracle at the time that the Asians asked for Agesilaus, when he was already king.

<sup>88</sup> Since it was a league war, one of the kings would be in command; if, therefore, Agesilaus was rejected by the oracle, the leadership would devolve on Pausanias. Slight corroborative evidence of the struggle at this time may perhaps be found in the 30 σύμβουλοι who accompanied Agesilaus. Xenophon (*Hell.* iii. 4. 2) says that he asked for them, and in this he is followed by Plutarch (*Ages.* 6. 4). They were, however, annual officials (*Hell.* iii. 4. 20) and on at least two subsequent occasions were attached to kings—Agesipolis in 381 (*Hell.* v. 3. 8) and Agesilaus in 361 (Plut. *Ages.* 36. 6)—and one is led to doubt whether Agesilaus would have asked for them. It is more probable that they represent a concession to the followers of Pausanias. On their duties see Busolt and Swoboda, *op. cit.*, pp. 676, n. 8, and 708. Lysander would have gone in any case; as *κρεωδατης* (Plut. *Ages.* 8. 1; *Lys.* 23. 11) he was one of the three *homoioi* who messaged with the king (see Xen. *Lac. pol.* 13. 1; and Busolt and Swoboda, *op. cit.*, p. 708, n. 1).

<sup>89</sup> *Lys.* 27. 2 ff. His attitude toward Thebes at this time agrees with his attitude at the time of Athens' surrender as expressed in the story of Polycaenus (i. 45. 5); cf. Meyer, *Theopomps Hellenika*, pp. 82 f., 87, where he states emphatically: "Wir können nicht zweifeln dass Plutarchs Angabe (*Lys.* 27 f.) richtig ist, dass in erster Linie Lysander diese Argumente vertreten und den Beschluss zum Angriff auf Böotien durchgesetzt hat; das entsprach nicht nur seiner Politik, sondern eröffnete ihm auch noch einmal die Aussicht, eine mächtige Stellung für sich selbst wieder zu gewinnen." What Meyer supposes Lysander's idea of a "powerful position" was I do not know, and I think Lysander was well content with the power and influence he already wielded. But with his estimate of Lysander's part in bringing on the war I agree.

His death at Haliartus, due, so it was thought, to Pausanias' failure to support him, brought matters to a head. Lysander's supporters were able successfully to prosecute Pausanias, who banished himself to Tegea. It is to be noted that they included among the charges: ὅτι τὸν δῆμον τῶν Ἀθηναίων λαβὼν ἐν τῷ Πειραιῷ ἀνήκε (*Hell.* iii. 5. 25), an indication that more than the immediate issue was involved; the question at issue was one of rival policies, and with Pausanias' banishment was also banished temporarily his anti-imperialist policy. The esteem in which Lysander was held at the time of his death is shown by the story of the ephors fining his daughters' suitors, who wished to break off their engagements when they discovered that he had not been a wealthy man.<sup>90</sup>

This brief account of Lysander's activities is sufficient to show that there is in our sources no suggestion of any "overthrow" of Lysander. Sparta's emergence from the Peloponnesian War as the first power in Greece challenged her powers of adaptability; it was by no means certain that she would throw off her Peloponnesian insularity or, if she tried to, whether her traditions and her constitution would be sufficiently flexible. Lysander had hitherto depended on his position as the war leader of Sparta, deriving his power from his office of *nauarch* or *epistoleus*, and had fashioned an empire of which he himself was the cornerstone. What his future intentions were we cannot say; he may have

<sup>90</sup> Plut. *Lys.* 30. 6; *Moral.* 230a. At some time between 402 and 397/6 must be set most of the anecdotes in *Moral.* 229c-d, in which Lysander seems to be playing a leading part in allied affairs.

hoped that under the new conditions of empire the nauarchy, which had assumed a new importance as a result of the war, would become the permanent basis of his power. But there were those at Sparta who under the leadership of Pausanias were determined that this should not be. The importance of Pausanias' intervention at Athens lay in the successful challenge to Lysander's unspoken claim to take complete control of Sparta's imperial policy; henceforth he must depend on his influence at home to make his policy effective in the empire. But his reputation, his experience, and his ability assured him a primacy in molding policy, especially when many Spartans, having tasted the fruits of wealth and empire,<sup>91</sup> were not prepared to abandon the empire, which was the source of these good things. This influence he continued to exercise until his death,<sup>92</sup> pursuing a policy which received its final indorsement by Sparta in the banishment of Pausanias. But of an overthrow in any other sense than that suggested, not only do the sources provide no evidence, but they positively refute it, by showing his influence supreme in all the crises that arose; and the other events are hardly to be understood unless one realizes the ever present influence of Lysander.

#### UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Xen. *Lac. pol.* 14. 2-4.

<sup>92</sup> What part he played in persuading Sparta to undertake expeditions in northern Greece, against the Messenians, and against Elis, we do not know; the fact that Agis commanded against Elis perhaps suggests that Lysander was in favor of it, since Pausanias' prosecution in 403 shows that these two were agreed on foreign policy. I believe that Lysander was in favor of, and probably urged on, the other campaigns, but of that there is no proof (see Beloch, *op. cit.*, III, Part I, 16-17).

## RÖMISCHE REKRUTENAUSBILDUNG IM LICHTE DER DISZIPLIN

ALFRED RICHARD NEUMANN

**M**EINE Ausführungen über das römische Heeresreglement<sup>1</sup> zeigten, dass die Zeitspanne vom Ende des vierten Jahrhunderts vor bis zu dem des vierten nach Christus für die Beurteilung der römischen Heeresdisziplin von Bedeutung ist. Denn nur innerhalb dieser Jahrhunderte offenbar bestand eine an ein schriftlich niedergelegtes Reglement gebundene militärische Ausbildung nationalrömischen Charakters.

Mit dieser Feststellung ist nicht viel erreicht, wenn nicht auch die Art dieser Ausbildung im einzelnen dargelegt und der Vergleich mit der der vorausgehenden und nachfolgenden Zeit gezogen wird. Erst dann lässt sich der jeweilige Grad der Disziplinierung vom Standpunkt der Ausbildung voll ermessen.

Auszugehen ist dabei von der Schilderung des Vegetius über die Grundausbildung, die wenigstens in ihren Hauptzügen als ein fester Bestandteil des nationalrömischen Heeresreglement aller Zeiten betrachtet werden muss.<sup>2</sup> Sie beginnt i. 9 folgendermassen:

Zuerst müssen die Rekruten den militärischen Schritt erlernen. Nichts ist auf dem Marsch oder in der Schlacht mehr zu beachten, als dass alle Soldaten die Marschordnung einhalten. Das kann aber nicht anders erreicht werden, als durch beständige Übung im schnellen und gleichmässigen Marschieren. Ein geteiltes und ungeordnetes Heer nimmt immer eine sehr schwere Gefahr von seiten der Feinde auf sich. Im gewöhnlichen militärischen Schritt sind 20,000 Doppelschritte in nicht mehr als 5 Sommerstunden zurückzulegen, im Eilschritt dagegen zur gleichen Zeit 24,000. Alles was

darüber hinausgeht, ist schon Laufen, dessen Abwicklung nicht genau bestimmt werden kann.

Wie diese Übung durchgeführt wurde, erfährt man nicht und ist auch sonst nicht angedeutet. Soviel steht aber fest, dass das schnelle und gleichmässige Marschieren im vorliegenden Fall nur dann einen Sinn haben konnte, wenn es in Formation erfolgte. Darauf weist nicht nur die Begründung der Übung hin, sondern bestätigt auch Veget. i. 26. In diesem Kapitel schildert er die Umwandlung der einzelnen Schlachtformationen ineinander. Voraussetzung dafür muss natürlich eine gewisse Fertigkeit in der Bildung derselben selbst wie von militärischen Formationen überhaupt gewesen sein, die aber wahrscheinlich nicht erst kurz vorher sondern offenbar schon im Zusammenhang mit der Übung im militärischen Schritt erworben wurde. Dafür sprechen nicht nur allgemeine Gründe, sondern vor allem die Überlegung, dass es keinen anderen Abschnitt des von Vegetius geschilderten Rekrutenausbildungskurses gibt, mit dem dieses einfache Exerzierien inhaltlich noch gut vereinbar wäre.<sup>3</sup> Die sich aufdräng-

<sup>1</sup> Damit ergibt sich aber weiter, dass das Wort *ambulare*, das Vegetius für die Übung zur Erlernung des militärischen Schrittes und, wie sich nun hinzufügen lässt, zu der der Bildung der verschiedenen Formationen anwendet, nicht nur das militärische Marschieren allein, sondern in gewissem Sinn auch exerzierien bedeuten muss. Diese Auffassung wird auch durch CIL, III, 3438, gestützt, wo der Ausdruck *ambulatorium* für das Exerzieren der Feuerwehr verwendet wird. Vgl. O. Hirschfeld, *S.-Ber. d. Akad. d. Wissenschaften Wien, Phil.-hist. Kl.*, CVII (1884), S. 252 und A. v. Domaszewski, "Ambulare," RE, I, Sp. 1816. Schliesslich gebraucht Veget. i. 27 *ambulare* für die Schlussübung des gesamten Ausbildungskurses, aus deren Schilderung deutlich ersichtlich wird, dass sie nicht nur aus marschieren, sondern auch exerzierien besteht.

<sup>2</sup> Eine scharfe Scheidung also zwischen *ambulare*

<sup>1</sup> Classical Philology, XL (1946), S. 217 ff.

<sup>2</sup> A. Neumann, a.a.O., S. 222.

ende Frage warum Vegetius die Übung in der Umwandlung der Schlachtformationen erst am Schluss seiner Ausführungen über die Ausbildung der *tirones* bringt und nicht schon im Rahmen der Übung im militärischen Schritt, wo sie allein sachlich berechtigt zu sein scheint, erfährt ihre eindeutige Beantwortung durch einen Überblick über den Aufbau des ganzen Kurses. Er zerfällt in vier Hauptabschnitte, von denen im ersten außer der bereits erwähnten Übung im militärischen Schritt, noch die im Lauf, Sprung und Schwimmen hinzukommt und der zweite die Waffenübungen umfasst, und zwar Fechten, Armatur, Speerwerfen, Pfeilschiessen, Werfen von Steinen mit den Händen und der Schleuder und Werfen mit bleivergossenen Pfeilen. Der dritte beinhaltet Pferdespringen, Gepäckmarschieren, Schlagen und Befestigen eines Lagers und das schon angeführte Umwandeln von Schlachtformationen ineinander.

Das Ganze stellt, wie man auf den ersten Blick erkennt, einen systematischen Aufbau dar, der vom Leichteren zum Schwereren fortschreitet und sich offenbar auch darin äussert, dass die Übungen des ersten Hauptabschnittes ohne, die des dritten und vierten aber, zu denen auch die in Rede stehende Übung gehört, mit Waffen durchgeführt wurden. Jedenfalls spricht für diese Auffassung die Tatsache, dass die Behandlung der Waffenübungen erst im nächsten Abschnitt erfolgt und jede Andeutung über ein

and *decurrere*, wie sie beispielsweise Domaszewski, a.a.O. vertritt, lässt sich nich aufrechterhalten. Wohl ist im Hinblick auf Tertullian *Ad marty.* 3: "in armis deambulando, campum decurriendo" daran festzuhalten, dass *ambulare* in erster Linie marschieren und *decurrere* exerzieren bedeutet, doch kann auch *ambulare* exerzieren und *decurrere* bloss marschieren heißen. Vgl. auch E. Saglio, "Decursio, decursus" in Daremburg-Saglio, II/1, 41; und Fiebiger, "Decursio" in RE, IV, Sp. 2353, die sich gegenseitig ausschliessen, da sie nur eine Bedeutung allein dem *decurrere* zu grunde legen.

Tragen von Waffen bei den Übungen des ersten fehlt. Im Einklang damit steht auch eine Stelle des dritten Abschnittes (i. 18), wo Vegetius den Pferdesprung erörtert und unter anderen auch davon spricht, dass die Rekruten diesen zunächst waffenlos, später aber, wenn es die Fortschritte erlaubten, mit Waffen ausführen. Diese Bemerkung ist nur dann gut verständlich, wenn es sich um eine Ausnahme handelt, das heisst, die übrigen Übungen des dritten und vierten Hauptabschnittes gleich von vornherein in Waffen geübt wurden. Schliesslich gewinnt man auch aus dem Text des Kapitels selbst, in dem Vegetius die Übung im Umwandeln der Schlachtformationen auseinandersetzt, den Eindruck, dass die Ausführung derselben die Handhabung der verschiedenen Waffen zur Voraussetzung hatte. Doch davon später. Das bisher Dargelegte genügt, um zu zeigen, dass die Übung im Umwandeln der Schlachtformationen ineinander durchaus an der richtigen Stelle steht.

Zusammenfassend lässt sich damit über die Übung im militärischen Schritt folgendes sagen:

Sie wurde wie alle Übungen des ersten Hauptabschnittes der von Vegetius geschilderten Exerzierordnung ohne Waffen und, wie ergänzend hinzugefügt werden kann, vermutlich auch ohne jede andere nennenswerte Belastung ausgeführt. Denn das Marschieren mit vollem Gepäck bildete eine eigene Übung, die erst im Rahmen des dritten Hauptabschnittes vor sich ging. Damit ist die allgemeine Auffassung, die das Gegenteil vertritt,<sup>4</sup> widerlegt und es erscheint nun das Kern-

<sup>4</sup> Wie z.B. E. Mehl, "Altrömisches Heeresturnen," *Mitteilungen des Vereines klassischer Philologen in Wien*, V (1928), S. 23; auch J. Sulser, *Disciplina: Beiträge zur inneren Geschichte des römischen Heeres von Augustus bis Vespasian* (Dissertation; Basel, 1920), S. 32, ist offenbar dieser Auffassung, äussert jedoch in Bezug auf die Möglichkeit der Eilmarschübung Bedenken.

stück der ganzen Übung, nämlich im gewöhnlichen militärischen Schritt 20,000, im Eilschritt 24,000 Doppelschritte in höchstens 5 Sommerstunden zurückzulegen,<sup>5</sup> nicht mehr als ausserordentliche sondern durchaus normale Marschleistung. Später allerdings dürfte die Übung zunächst dadurch erschwert worden sein, dass der Rekrut, sobald er mit den Waffen umzugehen verstand, diese dabei tragen musste und dann, als die Übung im Marsch mit vollem Gepäck einsetzte, auch dieses noch mit hinzukam.<sup>6</sup> Das ist aber etwas wesentlich anderes, als wenn man den *tiro* gleich von vornherein mit all diesen Sachen beladen sein lässt. Ferner wurde die Übung im militärischen Schritt zweifellos in Formation geübt, das heisst, die Bildung der verschiedenen militärischen Formationen miterlernt. Dass dies nur unter Anwendung des Gleichschrittes erfolgen konnte, ist wohl selbstverständlich. Die gleiche Schrittart ist aber auch für das Hauptstück der Übung anzunehmen. Sulzers<sup>7</sup> Auffassung, dass *militaris* und *plenus gradus* lediglich das Marschtempo bezeichnet, ist zwar begründet, wenn die Stelle "Militari ergo gradu xx milia passuum horis quinque dumtaxat aestivis conficienda sunt. Pleno autem gradu, qui citatior est, totidem horis xxiiii milia peragenda sunt" für

<sup>5</sup> Das sind im Durchschnitt 5 beziehungsweise 6 km. in der Stunde (vgl. z.B. Sulser, a.a.O., und Mehl, a.a.O.).

<sup>6</sup> In diesem Sinne glaube ich die Stelle ii. 23: "Silvam caedere, portare onera, transilire fossas, natare in mari sive fluminibus, gradu pleno ambulare vel currere etiam armatos cum sarcinis frequentissime convenit, ut cotidiani laboris usus in pace difficile non videatur in bello" deuten zu dürfen. Ferner ist kaum anzunehmen, dass die Übungen nur in der Reihenfolge vorgenommen wurden, die Vegetius angibt und die vermutlich dem Reglement entsprach. Und eine Übung, wenn sie einmal erfolgreich absolviert worden war, nur für die Dauer des ganzen Ausbildungskurses unterblieb. Dafür spricht ii. 23: "Juniores quidem et novi milites mane ac post meridiem ad omne genus exercebantur armorum."

<sup>7</sup> A.a.O., S. 32.

sich allein genommen wird. Im Zusammenhang mit dem Vorhergehenden aber, was allein massgebend ist, kann sie nicht aufrecht erhalten werden.

An die Übung im militärischen Schritt reihte sich die im Lauf und Sprung. Auch darüber gibt Vegetius (i. 9) bloss allgemeine Ausführungen, die kein klares und genaues Bild vermitteln. Nur das kann gesagt werden, dass die Übung im Lauf und Sprung zweifellos weitaus mehr Fälle berücksichtigte, als Vegetius erwähnt. Dazu gehörte sicherlich auch das Laufen im Eiltempo, von dem er i. 27 und ii. 23 spricht. Welche Strecke und ob überhaupt eine bestimmte dabei zurückgelegt werden musste, lässt sich nicht entscheiden. Die Bemerkung Suetons in der Biographie Galbas (6), dass dieser als Statthalter von Germanien im Beisein des Kaisers Caligula ein Feldmanöver grössten Stils leitete und dann noch in voller Rüstung 20,000 Doppelschritte neben dem Wagen des Kaisers herlief, ist gewiss bestechend. Die Zahl von 20,000 Doppelschritten, die auch bei der Hauptübung im militärischen Schritt verlangt wurde, sieht immerhin sehr reglementmässig aus. Vergegenwärtigt man sich aber die Leistung Galbas, so ist sie nicht nur aussergewöhnlich in Beziehung auf die Leistung des Manövers und den anschliessenden Lauf zusammen, sondern auch bezüglich des letzteren allein. Der Sprung muss sowohl als Frei- wie gemischter Sprung geübt worden sein, wobei letzterer bei Hochsprüngen eher anzunehmen ist, als ersterer.<sup>8</sup>

Den Abschluss des ersten Hauptabschnittes bildete die Übung im Schwimmen. Nach Vegetius (i. 10) sollen sich ihr in den Sommermonaten nicht nur die Infanterie, sondern auch die Reiter, Pferde und Trossknechte unterziehen. Die Notwendigkeit dafür zeigt die Kriegspraxis,

<sup>8</sup> Mehl, a.a.O., S. 24.

die die Vorfahren schon in jeder Weise beherrscht haben.

Die Beschränkung auf den Sommer, die Vegetius auch iii. 4 bestätigt, ist natürlich begreiflich, sicherlich aber nicht so aufzufassen, als ob im Winter gar nichts geschehen wäre. Zumindest nicht in jener Zeit, in der es künstliche Schwimmhallen gab, die auch im Winter leicht zweckentsprechend benutzt werden konnten.<sup>9</sup> Dass es sich dabei dann mehr um die Erlernung und Übung im Schwimmen an sich handeln musste, als um seine militärische Anwendung, ist wohl klar. Solche Winterübungen sind derart naheliegend, dass sie selbst dann vorausgesetzt werden dürfen, wenn beim römischen Heer auf die Ausbildung im Schwimmen kein besonderer Wert gelegt worden sein sollte. Das aber anzunehmen, ist auf Grund der Überlieferung nicht gut möglich.<sup>10</sup> Nur soviel lässt sich mit Bestimmtheit sagen, dass die Schwimmfertigkeit im römischen Heer nicht immer eine glänzende gewesen und nicht immer der des Gegners gleichgekommen sein kann. Mit Recht ist dafür

<sup>9</sup> Mehl, *Antike Schwimmkunst* (München, 1927), S. 116 ff.

<sup>10</sup> Wenn beispielsweise W. Schurz, *Die Militärorganisation Hadrians* (Gymnasialprogramme von München-Gladbach, 1897/98) (Kapitel: "Militärische Ausbildung, Schwimmen") auf Grund von Cass. Dio xlii. 5, Tac. Hist. II. 35 und v. 14 annimmt, dass das Schwimmen vor Hadrian kein notwendiger Bestandteil der militärischen Ausbildung gewesen sein kann, so ist das falsch. Denn Cass. Dio xlii. 5 stellt offensichtlich eine rhetorische Übertreibung dar. Tac. Hist. II. 35 bezieht sich auf Gladiatoren und v. 14 lässt den erwähnten Schluss überhaupt nicht zu. Beachtenswerter ist schon was K. J. Beloch in seiner *Römischen Geschichte* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1926), S. 311, gelegentlich der Erörterung der gallischen Katastrophe (390 v.Chr.) bemerkte, dass damals "von den römischen Soldaten nur verhältnismässig wenige des Schwimmens kundig gewesen sein können, da es in der Campagna ausser dem Tiber selbst und etwa noch dem Anio nur ganz unbedeutende Bäche gibt." Doch ist auch das kein triftiger Grund anzunehmen, dass das Schwimmen nicht seit altersher im Ausbildungskonzept für das römische Heer vorgesehen war. In dieser frühen Zeit gab es noch kein stehendes Heer, die Ausbildung konnte daher keine gleichmässige und intensive sein, sondern wurde erst kurz vor dem Feldzug in Angriff genommen.

auf Tac. *Hist.* v. 14 zu verweisen,<sup>11</sup> wo die Römer den Germanen gegenüber als furchtsame und im folgenden Kapitel übertrieben sogar als Nichtschwimmer bezeichnet werden. Allein natürlich lassen sich diese Stellen, die auf ein und dasselbe Ereignis Bezug haben, nicht verallgemeinern. Es gibt aber noch andere,<sup>12</sup> die das gleiche besagen, das heißt, die Unterlegenheit der nationalrömischen Truppen im Schwimmen dargestellt. So erzählt Tacitus im *Agricola* 18, dass dieser, als er zu Beginn seiner Statthalterschaft in Britannien nach Niederwerfung der Ordoviker sich entschlossen hatte, die Insel Mona zu besetzen, aber keine Schiffe besaß, um landen zu können, besonders ausgesuchte Mannschaften von den Hilfstruppen hinzuschickte, die mit den Furturken bekannt und ans Schwimmen von Haus so gewöhnt waren, dass sie zugleich Waffen und Pferde mitführen konnten. Ähnlich ist in den *Historien* iv. 12 davon die Rede, dass die Bataver auserlesene Reiterei besaßen, die im Schwimmen besonders darauf eingetüft war, samt Waffen und Pferden in ganzen Schwadronen durch den Rhein zu setzen. Dass das keine gewöhnliche, den nationalrömischen Soldaten geläufige Leistung darstellte, erfährt man auch aus Cass. Dio lxix. 9,<sup>13</sup> wo bemerkt wird, dass die römische Armee zur Zeit Hadrians derart gut geschult war, dass die batavischen

<sup>11</sup> So z.B. Sulzer, a.a.o., S. 29.

<sup>12</sup> Und die B. A. Müller in seiner Besprechung von Sulzers Dissertation in der *Philologischen Wochenschrift*, XLVI (1926), Sp. 53 f., offenbar übersehen hat. Seine Einstellung (a.a.o., Sp. 53 f.) zu Sulzers Darlegungen über die Schwimmabildung des römischen Heeres der frühen Kaiserzeit (a.a.o., S. 29) ist jedenfalls unhaltbar. Der Hinweis auf Suet. Aug. 64 besagt nichts.

<sup>13</sup> Damit in Widerspruch steht offenbar die bekannte Soranusinschrift, *CIL*, III, 3676, aus der nicht klar hervorgeht, ob Soranus bloss sagen will, dass er als einziger seiner aus Landsleuten zusammengesetzten Truppe die Ehre hatte, in Anwesenheit des Kaisers Hadrian die Donau vollgerüstet zu durchschwimmen, oder ob er überhaupt der einzige war, der es konnte. Für letztere Auffassung spricht allerdings der übrige Inhalt des Epigramms. Dazu Cichorius, "Cohors," *RE*, IV (1901), Sp. 252.

Reiter in voller Rüstung über die Donau schwimmen konnten. Diese zwei letzten Beispiele legen den Gedanken nahe, dass auch die Tac. *Agric.* 18 erwähnten ausgewählten Mannschaften der Hilfstruppen Bataver gewesen sind. Ob freilich zur Gänze, ist in Hinblick auf das unbestimmte *lectissimos auxiliarium* fraglich. Eher wird man daran denken müssen, dass noch andere Volksstämme vertreten waren, sicherlich meistens Gallier und Germanen, deren Schwimmtüchtigkeit die antike Literatur an vielen Stellen bezeugt<sup>14</sup> und noch zu einer Zeit betont, als die Barbarisierung des römischen Heeres schon weitgehende Fortschritte gemacht hatte und seine Rüstung und Bewaffnung keineswegs mehr als schwer bezeichnet werden konnten.<sup>15</sup>

Auch in der Republik und vielleicht schon seit dem Zeitpunkt als es überhaupt ein römisches Heer gab, scheint das Schwimmen in voller Rüstung eine Besonderheit gebildet zu haben. Dafür zeugt vor allem Silius Italicus, der in seinen *Punica* viii. 551 von Scipio Africanus dem Älteren diese Fertigkeit hervorhebt. Daselbe erwähnt Plutarch<sup>16</sup> von Sertorius und die gleiche Richtung weisen die sagen-

<sup>14</sup> Siehe Mehl, "Altgermanische Schwimmkunst," *Deutsches Schwimmerblatt*, XXXII (1927), Heft 5 und 6; und "Schwimmen," *RE*, Suppl. V (1931), Sp. 863. Nicht einverstanden bin ich mit der Behauptung, dass "bei den Germanen das Schwimmen in Waffen und Rüstung etwas ganz gewöhnliches gewesen sei." Aus den Stellen, die Mehl dafür anführt, geht nur hervor, dass die betreffenden germanischen Truppenabteilungen über die Maas (Tac. *Hist.* v. 66), den Rhein (Tac. *Hist.* v. 18), die Eder (Tac. *Ann.* i. 26), die Ems (Tac. *Ann.* II. 8), den Po (Tac. *Hist.* II. 35) und den Tigris (Amm. Marc. xxv. 6. 11) schwimmen, nicht aber wie sie ihre Rüstungen und Waffen über diese Flüsse schaffen, so sehr es nahe liegt, ein Schwimmen darin anzunehmen. Aus Tac. *Agric.* 18, *Hist.* IV. 12, Cass. Dio Ixix. 9 und der Soranusinschrift gewinnt man im Gegentheil den Eindruck, dass das Schwimmen in Rüstung und Waffen nicht nur eine Besonderheit bestimmter Hilfstruppen den Römern gegenüber war, sondern innerhalb dieser Hilfskontingente wieder nur einzelne Abteilungen und Soldaten eine besondere Fertigkeit darin hatten.

<sup>15</sup> Amm. Marc. xxv. 6.

<sup>16</sup> Sert. 3; vgl. Amm. Marc. xxiv. 6. 7.

haften Erzählungen von dem Rutulerheld Turnus<sup>17</sup> und der Verteidigung der Tiberbrücke durch Horatius Cocles,<sup>18</sup> wenn ihnen auch nicht die gleiche Beweiskraft zukommt.

Man könnte somit zu der Auffassung kommen, dass allgemein das Schwimmen in voller Rüstung im Reglement nicht vorgesehen war und von den Soldaten auch nicht geübt wurde. Dem widerspricht jedoch der Bericht Caesars *Bell. Gall.* iv. 24 über seine erste Landung in Britannien. In ihm ist unter anderen von Soldaten die Rede, die von den Schiffen aus ins Meer springen und im Kampf mit dem Feind die nahe Küste erreichen. Mit Recht betont Mehl,<sup>19</sup> dass diese eine gewisse Schwimmfertigkeit behabt haben müssen, um sich einem derartigen Wagnis zu unterziehen.

Damit wird das bestätigt, was sich schon in anderer Beziehung aus dem vom Vegetius wiedergegebenen Ausbildungskurs für Rekruten ergab, nämlich dass ihm eine vom Leichteren zum Schwereren fortschreitende Methode innewohnte und demnach in der Schwimmausbildung zunächst das Schwimmen als solches, später aber mit Waffen und Rüstung gelehrt wurde. Dass aber auf letztere Art besonderer Wert gelegt worden wäre, geht entgegen der Ansicht von Mehl<sup>20</sup> aus den Quellen nicht hervor, so sehr auch rein militärische Erwägungen dafür sprechen.

Was das Pferdeschwimmen betrifft, so handelt es sich natürlich auch hier nur um bestimmte den militärischen Erfordernissen entsprechende Anwendungsarten, da die Pferde schon von vornherein schwimmen können. Als Vorschrift muss dieses Schwimmtraining aus allgemein mili-

<sup>17</sup> Virg. *Aen.* ix. 805–16.

<sup>18</sup> Dionys. v. Halik. v. 24 und Liv. ii. 10. In beiden Berichten steht das Schwimmen in voller Rüstung im Mittelpunkt der Erzählung.

<sup>19</sup> Antike Schwimmkunst, S. 75 und 70.

<sup>20</sup> A.A.O., S. 62.

tärischen Gründen zu den ältesten Bestandteilen des römischen Heeresreglement zählen und sich darin auch ziemlich lang erhalten haben. Dafür zeugt besonders ein Erlass vom 27. Mai 391, der sowohl im *Codex Theodosianus* wie im *Codex Justinianus* steht.<sup>21</sup>

Wie dieses Schwimmen durchgeführt wurde, ist ebensowenig bekannt, wie der Schwimmunterricht für Soldaten. Mag sein, dass man auch hier, soweit die Schwimmfertigkeit als solche in Frage kommt, Binsen- oder Korkschwimmgürtel<sup>22</sup> verwendete, oder der Anfänger einfach ins Wasser geworfen wurde und nun sehen musste, wie er weiter kam. Gleichfalls nicht zu entscheiden, ist die Frage, welche Stilart und ob überhaupt eine bevorzugt wurde.<sup>23</sup>

Hatte der Rekrut das Schwimmen erlernt, dann war für ihn der erste Teil der militärischen Ausbildung abgeschlossen, wenn auch nicht in dem Sinne, dass nun jede weitere Schulung in dem bisher Durchgenommenen unterblieb.<sup>24</sup> Der zweite umfasste die Waffenübungen, die mit dem Gladiatorenfechten begannen.

Diese Übung wurde, wie sich aus einer zuverlässigen Notiz bei Valerius Maximus (ii. 3. 2) ergibt, im Jahre 105 v.Chr. aus den Gladiatorenschulen übernommen und im Heere wahrscheinlich in der Form eines neuen Reglements eingeführt. Lehrer aus der Schule des C. Aurelius Scaurus hatten den Auftrag, die Soldaten mit der Fechtlehre des P. Rutilius Rufus vertraut zu machen.

Auch sie stammt also nicht aus Cato,<sup>25</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Mehl, a.a.O.

<sup>22</sup> Mehl, a.a.O., S. 71 f. und 115 f.

<sup>23</sup> Mehl, a.a.O., S. 61 f. und 90 ff.

<sup>24</sup> Siehe Anm. 6.

<sup>25</sup> Jedenfalls nicht in der Form, wie sie bei Vegetius vorliegt. Denn dass die Soldaten in der Handhabung ihres *gladius* bis zur Einführung des Gladiatorenfechtes in irgend einer Weise unterwiesen und geübt wurden, ist wohl selbstverständlich und geht auch aus der zitierten Stelle bei Valerius Maximus und vor

auf den D. Schenk<sup>26</sup> die im ersten Buch des vegetianischen Werkes dargelegte Exerzierordnung zurückführen will.

Welche besondere Bedeutung der Schulung im Fechten von seiten der römischen Führung beigelegt wurde, ersieht man daraus, dass sich nach Vegetius (i. 11; ii. 23) darin die Rekruten wie in den Waffen überhaupt vor- und nachmittags üben mussten, während dies bei den anderen Übungen normalerweise offenbar nicht der Fall war. Das erklärt sich daraus, dass gerade durch die Schulung jedes einzelnen Legionsinfanteristen im kunstgerechten Gladiatorenfechten der Kampfwert der Legionen ungemein stieg. Das Hauptmoment der römischen Kampfart der klassischen Periode lag vor allem im stehenden Gefecht, wobei es weniger auf Massenwirkung als auf die Qualität des Einzelkämpfers ankam. Diese beruhte nicht nur auf Geschicklichkeit, Ausdauer und Disziplin sondern auch in der kunstgerechten Handhabung des Schwertes. Von dem Ausgang dieses Kampfes von Mann gegen Mann hing der erfolgreiche Abschluss des folgenden Generalangriffes und in der Folge die Endentscheidung ab.<sup>27</sup>

Diese Steigerungsmöglichkeit des Kampfwertes der römischen Truppen erkannt zu haben, ist wahrscheinlich das besondere Verdienst von Marius, der auch sonst reformatorisch auf das römische Heerwesen gewirkt hat und dem es offenbar ein neues Reglement verdankt.

Wie weit sich diese Neueinführung er-

allem aus Fragment 14 von Catos Schrift über das römische Heerwesen hervor. Siehe M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, I<sup>8</sup> (München, 1909), S. 253 ff.

<sup>26</sup> "Flavius Vegetius Renatus: Die Quellen der Epitoma rei militaris," *Klio*, Beihet XXII (N.F., Heft IX) (Leipzig, 1930), S. 38; und Neumann, "Das augusteisch-hadrianiische Armeereglement und Vegetius," *Classical Philology*, XXXI (1936), S. 9.

<sup>27</sup> J. Kromayer-G. Veith, *Heerwesen und Kriegsführung der Griechen und Römer* (München, 1928), S. 361 ff.

streckte, ob sie nur die römische Legioneninfanterie oder auch die Legionenkavallerie wie die verschiedenen Hilfstruppenteile umfasste, lässt sich nicht entscheiden. Doch geht man gewiss nicht fehl, wenn man sie nur auf die Truppenteile erstreckt, die sich der typisch nationalrömischen Fechtweise bedienten.

Natürlich sollte mit der Einführung des Kunstfechtens der römische Soldat kein Kunstfechter im Sinne der Gladiatoren werden, was schon im Hinblick auf das verschiedenartig zusammengewürfelte Truppenmaterial praktisch unmöglich war, sondern die bisher geübte Handhabung seines Schwertes derart verbessert werden, dass sich daraus eine merkliche Steigerung des Kampfwertes der Gesamtheit ergab.

Der Anlass zu der Einführung dieser Übung scheint sich wahrscheinlich vor allem aus der erfolgreichen Verwendung von Gladiatoren im Heere ergeben zu haben.

Wie die Übung selbst im einzelnen durchgeführt wurde, ist, wie stets bei Vegetius, dem es aus bestimmten Gründen nur auf die allgemeinen Züge ankam, nicht ersichtlich. Sein selbst für Fachleute ödes Buch wäre durch die Schilderung von Details, noch ungeniessbarer geworden. Aus seiner Schilderung (i. 11, 12; ii. 23) erfährt man bloss, dass als Übungswaffen ein runder Flechtwerkschild und ein hölzernes Rapier verwendet wurden, die das doppelte Gewicht der entsprechenden gewöhnlichen Waffen hatten. Ferner, dass wie bei den Gladiatoren ein fest in die Erde gerammter und sechs Fuss emporragender Holzpfahl den Gegner vorstellte, gegen den sich der Rekrut in jeder Kunst des Angriffs und der Verteidigung versuchte. Wobei der Stich bevorzugt wurde, weil er eher tödlich wirkte als der Hieb und außerdem während der Ausführung den Körper nicht schutzlos liess.

Was das Aussehen des Pfahls betrifft, so lässt sich ergänzend zu Vegetius sagen, dass der Kopf durch eine Verdickung am oberen Ende angedeutet war, auf die entweder ein Visierhelm gesetzt wurde, oder die Form eines solchen nachahmte. Das ergibt sich aus Abbildungen, die bei Daremberg-Saglio<sup>28</sup> und Schreiber<sup>29</sup> wiedergegeben sind. Wie die anderen Körperteile erkenntlich waren, lässt sich nicht feststellen. Strohpuppen, die in neuzeitlichen Heeren für ähnliche Zwecke in Übung waren und noch sind, scheinen damals unbekannt gewesen zu sein.

An Stelle des hölzernen Pfahles trat wahrscheinlich je nach den Fortschritten in dieser Übung bald oder später der wirkliche Mensch, also der Kampf von Mann gegen Mann, der allein die richtige Praxis vermitteln konnte.<sup>30</sup> Dass dabei die Anwesenheit des Lehrers erforderlich war, der nicht nur als solcher und Schiedsrichter zu wirken hatte, sondern, wenn es zu heiss her ging, die Kämpfenden trennen musste, ist selbstverständlich und zeigen verschiedene Abbildungen.<sup>31</sup>

Damit ist aber schon der Übergang zur nächsten Übung, der Armatur, gegeben. Vegetius (i. 13 und ii. 23) schildert nicht ihr Wesen, er setzt es vielmehr voraus, zumal sie, wie er selbst bemerkt, zu seiner Zeit noch teilweise in Übung war.<sup>32</sup> Nur ii. 23<sup>33</sup> gibt er eine schwache Andeutung,

<sup>28</sup> II, Abb. 3572.

<sup>29</sup> *Kulturhist. Bilderatlas*, I (Leipzig, 1885), Taf. XXXII, Abb. 3 u. 6.

<sup>30</sup> Das vermutet auch richtig Sulser, a.a.O., S. 30. Seinen Zweifel, ob die Rekruten sich tatsächlich mit dem hölzernen Schwert und Schild am Pfahle übten, vermag ich nicht zu teilen. Denn Vegetius hätte kaum etwas empfohlen, was nicht lange Zeit praktisch in Geltung war.

<sup>31</sup> Z.B. Daremberg-Saglio, II, Abb. 3573.

<sup>32</sup> Pollack, "Armatura," RE, II, Sp. 1178 f.

<sup>33</sup> "Armaturam, quae festis diebus exhibetur in cireo, non tantum armaturae, qui sub campidoctore sunt, sed omnes aequaliter contubernales cotidiana meditatione discibant. Nam et velocitas usu ipso adquiritur corporis et scientia feriendi hostem seque protegendi, praesertim si gladiis communis dimicetur."

aus der zu entnehmen ist, dass die Armatur ein Scheingefecht ganzer Abteilungen gewesen sein muss, das offenbar seinen Höhepunkt im Kampf mit dem Schwerte fand. Dass dieser Kampf, beziehungsweise die Rekonstruktion des stehenden Gefechtes das Um und Auf war, geht daraus hervor, dass die Übung im Fechten, die am Pfahl begann, und dann zum Einzelkampf von Mann gegen Mann überging, nur darin ihre konsequente Weiterentwicklung und ihren Abschluss finden konnte. Aus diesem Grund halte ich diese Form der Armatur für die ursprüngliche, während ihre mehr auf die Schaulust der Menge abgestimmte Gestaltung, wie sie Livius *xliv. 9* schildert, einer späteren Zeit angehören muss. Ihren militärischen Charakter büsst sie aber dadurch keineswegs ein. Im Gegenteil er wurde noch gesteigert, da im Laufe der Zeit mit der Armatur noch andere Übungen verbunden wurden, vor allem wahrscheinlich solche in der Bildung der verschiedenen Formationen, die gut einexerziert auf die Zuschauer Eindruck machen mussten. So war beispielsweise die Bildung der Schildkröte (*testudo*) nicht nur bei der Infanterie sondern auch bei der Kavallerie ein besonderes Glanzstück.<sup>34</sup> Das schlagartige Zusammensetzen der Schilder und bei der Kavallerie dazu noch das ebenso blitzartige wie gleichzeitige Niederlassen der Pferde auf die Vorderfüsse<sup>35</sup> setzte eine besonders gute Schulung und Disziplin der betreffenden Truppen voraus und verfehlte ihre Wirkung nicht. Dabei war alles, wie Livius<sup>36</sup> mit Recht betont, auf den Ernstfall berechnet. Man wäre natürlich in Hinblick auf die mehr schon gladiatorenhafte Ausgestaltung der Armatur—bildete doch nach Livius der Zweikampf auf einer von ungefähr 60 oder

mehr Mann gebildeten *testudo* einen Hauptpunkt des Programmes—versucht ihre Einführung beim Heer in dieser Form mit der des kunstmässigen Gladiatorenfechtens im Jahre 105 v.Chr. zu verbinden. Dem würde auch nicht das Jahr 169 v.Chr., in das Livius seine Schilderung setzt, entgegenstehen, da es bekannt ist, wie sehr die Schriftsteller der augusteischen Zeit aus bestimmten Gründen Einrichtungen ihrer Epoche in eine frühe Vergangenheit zu projizieren pflegten. Doch ist zu bedenken, dass seit dem Augenblick, als dem Kampfe mit dem Schwerte eine besondere Bedeutung zukam, auch auf Übungen damit Wert gelegt werden musste.<sup>37</sup> Dabei konnte sich die mehr auf den Zirkus berechnete Gestaltung der Armatur umso eher entwickelt haben, je mehr das Verlangen bestand, der Öffentlichkeit Rechenschaft über die Ausbildung des Heeres zu geben und je grösser die propagandistische Wirkung war, die man sich von solchen Vorführungen versprach.<sup>38</sup>

Durch die Schilderung des Vegetius erfährt man weiters, dass die Armatur beziehungsweise die Übungen, die später unter diesem Namen zusammengefasst wurden, unter der Leitung von Exerziermeistern standen. Auch daraus geht die Bedeutung hervor, die die römische Führung den Fechtübungen beimass. Denn die anderen bisher besprochenen Exerzitien leiteten wahrscheinlich Centurionen oder altgediente Soldaten.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>34</sup> Und das ist zweifellos seit der Ausbildung der Manipulartaktik, die den römischen Soldaten vom Kampfmassenglied zum Einzelkämpfer machte, der Fall (Kromayer-Veith, a.a.O., S. 263 ff. u. 290).

<sup>35</sup> Damit steht auch Fragment 14 der Schrift des älteren Cato über das römische Heerwesen in Einklang, da es den Nachweis erbringt, dass Cato auch die militärische Ausbildung, und zwar im Gegensatz zu den Gladiatorenkünsten behandelte. Und das ist bei dem oppositionellen Charakter seines Werkes nur dann gut zu begreifen, wenn bereits zu seiner Zeit Versuche gemacht wurden, Praktiken der Gladiatoren-schulen im römischen Heer einzuführen.

<sup>36</sup> Vgl. auch Sulser, a.a.O., S. 29.

<sup>37</sup> Liv. a.a.O.; siehe auch Pollack, a.a.O.

<sup>38</sup> Cass. Dio xlix. 30.

<sup>39</sup> A.a.O.; "... ludero circensi ad usum belli verso....

Bei Vegetius, wie überhaupt in spätromischer Zeit, heißen die Exerziermeister *campidoctores*,<sup>40</sup> früher aber, wie Inschriften beweisen,<sup>41</sup> *exercitatores*. Ihnen unterstanden, wie Vegetius bemerkt, die Armaturisten, die zweifellos jene Gruppe von Soldaten darstellten, die durch ihre Fechtkunst besonders hervorragten und im Zirkus die Glanznummern zu bestreiten hatten. Aus ihnen, oder besser gesagt, den *doctores armorum*<sup>42</sup> gingen wahrscheinlich die künftigen Exerziermeister hervor.<sup>43</sup>

Auch aus der Belohnung für die Waffenmeister wie der Strafbestimmung für die Soldaten (i. 13),<sup>44</sup> die bei den Fechtü-

bungen schlecht abschnitten, ersieht man einerseits die besondere Bedeutung, die die militärische Fechtkunst bei den Römern einnahm, andererseits, dass die Ansprüche, die dabei an jeden Soldaten gestellt wurden, nicht allzu hohe gewesen sein können. Allerdings geht aus dem vegetianischen Text nicht hervor, ob sich die Bestimmung auf die Übung am Pfahl, oder den Einzelkampf von Mann gegen Mann, oder die Armatur selbst bezog. Denn das *illa prolusione* kann auf jede der soeben genannten Teilübungen bezogen werden. Vom sachlichen Standpunkt aus scheidet aber die Armatur aus, weil bei ihr, dem Massengefecht, am wenigsten die Möglichkeit bestand, die Faupelze festzustellen.

Mit der Armatur waren die Fechtübungen abgeschlossen und es folgte das Werfen mit dem Speer, der zweiten Hauptwaffe des römischen Nationalheeres. Auch diese Übung begann nach Vegetius (i. 14; ii. 23) am hölzernen Pfahl mit Wurfspießen, die ein grösseres Gewicht hatten, als die wirklichen. Dabei achtete der Waffenmeister darauf, dass sie mit aller Macht geschwungen und mit festem Wurf aus der Nähe oder Ferne in den Pfahl oder dicht daneben geschleudert wurden.

Die Wichtigkeit dieser Übung geht daraus hervor, dass auch hier, wie bei der Armatur ein Waffen- beziehungsweise Exerziermeister die Leitung hatte. Dabei ist es gleichgültig, ob und welche Speerart in der Schilderung des Vegetius gemeint ist. Wie das Schwert, gehörte allgemein auch der Wurfspeer seit früher Zeit zu den Hauptwaffen der römischen Kerntruppen und seine Handhabung muss vom Zeitpunkt seiner Anwendung an in gleicher

<sup>40</sup> R. Grosse, *Römische Militärgeschichte von Gallienus bis zum Beginn der byzantinischen Themenverfassung* (Berlin, 1920), S. 126 f.; E. Stein, *Geschichte des spätromischen Reiches* (Wien, 1928), S. 83; und Fr. Lammert, *Die römische Taktik zu Beginn der Kaiserzeit und die Geschichtsschreibung* (Leipzig, 1931) (*Philologus*, Supplémentband XXIII, Heft 2), S. 31.

<sup>41</sup> CIL, VI, 3736, 31122; und A. v. Domaszewski, "Armatura," RE, II, Sp. 1178. Die *exercitatores* wie R. Cagnat, Daremberg-Saglio, II, S. 886, und Fiebiger, RE, VI, Sp. 1588 f., nur auf die Kavallerie zu beziehen, ist jedenfalls, soweit die Armatur in Frage kommt, nach CIL, III, 31122 unmöglich. Doch glaube ich auch sonst, da die betreffenden Inschriften mit Ausnahme von CIL, III, 3470 und VIII, 1322, *exercitator* auch dann in Verbindung mit *equitum* gebrauchen, wo es sich um keine selbständige und ausschliessliche berittene Einheit handelt, was zweifellos merkwürdig wäre, wenn dieses Wort allein schon den Kavallerieinstructor bedeutet hätte. Den Zusammenhang der *exercitatores* mit den *campidoctores* deutet bereits richtig M. Durry, *Les Cohortes prétoriennes* (Paris, 1938), S. 117 an. Erst als das Centurionat verfiel, wurde die gesamte Truppenausbildung in die Hand der *campidoctores* gelegt.

<sup>42</sup> Fiebiger, RE, V, Sp. 1254, und Durry, a.a.o., S. 117. Was man unter dem *discens armaturae* bzw. *armorum* verstehen soll (Durry, a.a.o., S. 116), ist nicht klar. Wahrscheinlich aber wird damit jeder Soldat gemeint sein, der zur Sonderausbildung als Armaturist bestimmt und als solcher bei Beförderung zum Centurio bevorzugt wurde (Fiebiger, RE, VI, Sp. 1588).

<sup>43</sup> Damit würde auch Lydus, De mag. I. 46 übereinstimmen, der *armatura* als Charge mit ὁρογέτην gleichgesetzt. Dass die Armaturisten, wie beispielsweise Schurz, a.a.o. (Kapitel: "Übungen im allgemeinen"), meint, leichter bewaffnet gewesen wären als die anderen Legionssoldaten, ist in keiner Weise durch Veget. i. 13 begründet.

<sup>44</sup> "Ita autem severe apud maiores exercitii disciplina servata est, ut et doctores armorum duplis remunerarentur annonis et milites, qui parum in illa prolusione profererant, pro frumento hordeum coge-

rentur accipere nec ante eis in tritico redderetur annona, quam sub praesentia prefecti legionis, tribunorum vel principiorum experimentis datis ostendissent se omnia, quae erant in militari arte, complere."

oder ähnlicher Weise geübt worden sein. Von der Übung am Pfahl ging man wahrscheinlich auch hier wie beim Fechten zum Scheinkampf von Mann gegen Mann und schliesslich zu dem ganzer Abteilungen über. Letzteres setzt beispielsweise die Pilumsalve voraus, die besondere Exaktheit verlangte. Frühzeitig muss aber der Massenscheinkampf mit dem Wurfspeer, der ebenfalls ein wesentliches Moment des stehenden Gefechtes war, mit der Armatur, die, wie gezeigt, in der Hauptsache eine Rekonstruktion desselben bedeutet, verbunden worden sein.

Mit der Übung im Fechten und Speerwerfen waren die Übungen in den Hauptwaffen des römischen Soldaten erschöpft. Was nun an Waffenübungen noch folgte, bezog sich auf Hauptwaffen bestimmter Auxilien, die bei den Nationalrömern nur als Neben- und Hilfswaffen galten. Die Ausbildung in ihnen erwies sich aber auch für die römischen Legionen als vorteilhaft und fand später als Vorschrift in ihrem Reglement Aufnahme. Meistens dürfte jedoch nur ein Teil der Legionstruppen in diesen Waffen geschult worden sein, wie beispielsweise beim Pfeilschiessen, das Vegetius i. 15 und ii. 23 schildert. Danach wurde bloss ein Drittel oder Viertel der Rekruten, das besonders geeignet erschien, zu Fuss oder zu Pferd mit hölzernen Bögen und Pfeilen unter Leitung erfahrener Waffenmeister am Pfahl geübt. Als Kopf dienten Stroh- oder Strauchbündel, die auf 600 Fuss Entfernung mit bestimmten Pfeilen getroffen werden mussten. Auf die gleiche Art übten sich nach Vegetius ii. 23 die zur Sonderausbildung als Schleuderer bestimmten Legionäre mit Steinen beziehungsweise Blei,<sup>45</sup> was aber in der Darlegung dieser Übung (i. 16) unerwähnt bleibt.

<sup>45</sup> Dass auch Blei verwendet wurde, beweisen die erhaltenen gebliebenen Schleuderbleie. Fleibiger, RE, II. Reihe, 2. Halbb. (1920), Sp. 1744.

Es ist nicht wahrscheinlich, dass die angegebene Entfernung die einzige war, auf die man sich einspielte. Doch nicht nur Stroh- und Strauchbündel, sondern auch runde Scheiben wurden als Ziel für die Übung im Pfeilschiessen verwendet. Das beweist der in die frühe Kaiserzeit zu setzende Grabstein eines Angehörigen der Ala Augusta Ituriorum aus Arrabona. Auf dem Reliefbild ist eine hohe Stange zu sehen auf die eine runde Scheibe gesetzt ist und in der bereits drei Pfeile stecken. Gegen sie sprengt der reitende Schütze mit gespanntem Bogen an.<sup>46</sup> Ferner ergibt sich aus Vegetius ii. 23,<sup>47</sup> dass diese Stelle dem römischen Heeresreglement als Schriftwerk näher stehen muss, als Vegetius i. 15,<sup>48</sup> und beide sich so ergänzen, dass die konsequente Entwicklung von der fallweisen Erprobung bis zur festen Reglementierung wiedergespiegelt wird. Sie dürfte mit grösster Wahrscheinlichkeit durch die marianische Heeresreform erfolgt sein, da von dieser Zeit ab die steigende Bedeutung der Fernwaffen<sup>49</sup> besonders in Erscheinung tritt.

Dem Kaiser Hadrian lässt sich, wie ich

<sup>46</sup> H. Hofmann, *Römische Militärgabesteine der Donauländer* ("Sonderschriften des Österr. Arch. Institutes in Wien," Bd. V [Wien, 1905]), S. 37 f.

<sup>47</sup> "Quantum autem utilitas boni sagittarii in proelii habeant et Cato in libris de disciplina militari evidenter ostendit et Claudius pluribus laculatoribus institutis atque perdoctis hostem, cui prius impar fuerat, superavit. Africanus quidem Scipio, cum adversum Numantinos, qui exercitus populi Romani sub iugum miserant, esset acie certaturus, altere se superiore futurum esse non credidit, nisi in omnibus centuriis lectos sagittarios miscisset."

<sup>48</sup> "Sagittarii vero vel funditores scopas, hoc est fruticum vel straminum fasces, pro signo ponebant, ita ut sexcentis pedibus removerentur a signo, ut sagittis vel certe lapidibus ex fustibalo destinatis signum saepius tangerent."

<sup>49</sup> Lammert, a.a.O., S. 1 ff. Dass diese Ausbildung der Legionäre im Pfeilschiessen und im Werfen von Steinen wie Blei aus der Hand und mit der Schleuder im ersten vorchristlichen Jahrhundert praktisch in Geltung war, beweisen nicht nur mehrere Stellen der antiken Literatur, sondern auch die vielen gefundenen Schleuderbleie (Fleibiger, RE, II. Reihe, 2. Halbb. [1920], Sp. 1744).

in dieser Zeitschrift<sup>50</sup> schon zeigen konnte, vermutlich bloss die Ausbildung der Legionen im Schiessen mit Blei vergossenen Pfeilen zuschreiben, die eine Eigentümlichkeit der Illyrer darstellte und mit der bei Vegetius (i. 17) die Waffenübungen und damit der zweite Teil des Rekrutenausbildungskurses abschliessen. Doch dürfte in der Praxis dieses Schiessen unmittelbar dem mit gewöhnlichen Pfeilen gefolgt sein und das Werfen von Steinen mit der Hand und aus der Schleuder faktisch den Schluss gebildet haben.

Durch die Absolvierung der Übungen mit den Waffen war der Rekrut im Gebrauch derselben eingewiesen, man konnte sie ihm nun bedenkenlos anvertrauen und alle Übungen, die er noch durchzumachen hatte, wurden, wie gezeigt, von ihm in Waffen durchgeführt. Nur die erste des dritten Ausbildungsabschnittes bildete eine Ausnahme. Sie befasst sich mit dem Pferdespringen (Vegetius i. 18), das nicht, wie man zunächst glauben würde, nur für die berechnet war, die zur Kavallerie wollten, sondern sich auf alle Rekruten bezog, ohne Berücksichtigung der Waffengattung, der sie später zugeführt werden sollten. Auch darin zeigt sich, wie in den zuletzt besprochenen Übungen die in der römischen Armee seit der Aufstellung von ausländischen Spezialformationen steigende Tendenz, den Legionen jene Ausbildung zu vermitteln, die sie jeder Eventualität gewachsen zeigen und ihnen damit ihre seit altersher zentrale und alles andere überragende Stellung im Heeresorganismus sichern sollte. Die Einführung dieser kavalleristischen Schulung der gesamten Legion wird ebenfalls mit der Heeresreform des Marius in Verbindung zu bringen sein, da einerseits nationale Kavallerie um diese Zeit zu-

<sup>50</sup> XLI (1946), S. 219 f. Dazu auch Flebiger, RE, II. Reihe, 2. Halbb. (1920), Sp. 1743; und Lammert, a.a.O., S. 31.

letzt nachweisbar ist, andererseits seither auch jene Taktik besonders in Erscheinung tritt, die in der wirksamen Zusammenarbeit von Kavallerie und Infanterie ihren Ausdruck fand.<sup>51</sup>

Ausgeführt wurde das Pferdespringen zunächst auf hölzernen Pferden, die im Sommer auf freiem Feld, im Winter unter einem Dach aufgestellt waren. An diesen Pferden mussten nach Vegetius die Rekruten anfangs unbewaffnet, später aber, wenn sie Fortschritte gemacht hatten, in Waffen von links und rechts auf- und abspringen lernen. Es ist klar, dass an diese Vorübung unmittelbar jene am lebenden Pferd folgte und damit früher oder später ein gewisser Reitunterricht verbunden werden musste, zumal, wie Arrian zeigt,<sup>52</sup> dazu auch das Auf- und Absitzen in voller Rüstung auf das laufende Pferde gehörte. Dabei bot sich die beste Gelegenheit, jene ausfindig zu machen, die sich für die Legionenkavallerie eigneten. Diese Springübungen waren von besonderer Bedeutung und stellten an die Geschicklichkeit des Einzelnen grosse Anforderungen, da Steigbügel wahrscheinlich nicht verwendet wurden.<sup>53</sup> Das Pferdespringen war noch zur Zeit des Vegetius in Übung und scheint sich auch lange nachher bis in die neuere Zeit erhalten zu haben. So ist beispielsweise bis zum Jahre 1903 in der französischen Kavallerie bei den Fechtübungen auf hölzernem Pferd ein auf einem Holzgestell befestigter unbeweglicher Klotz in Verwendung gewesen, der als Türkenkopf bezeichnet wurde und auf den der Reiter nach Kommando seine

<sup>51</sup> Lammert, a.a.O., S. 3 ff. Dass die Legionen zu Caesars Zeiten kavalleristisch in diesem Sinne ausgebildet waren, ergibt sich aus Caes. *Bell. Gall.* i. 42.

<sup>52</sup> *Taktik* 43.

<sup>53</sup> Ob die alte Auffassung, dass es bei den Römern Steigbügel überhaupt nicht gegeben hat, noch zu Recht besteht, ist seit den Darlegungen von H. Jacobi in der *Germania*, VI (1922), S. 89 ff., zweifelhaft geworden.

Hiebe führte.<sup>54</sup> Dass sich hier bis zum Übungspfahl und Holzpferd des römischen Heeres eine kontinuierliche Entwicklung zurückverfolgen lässt, halte ich für sehr wahrscheinlich, obwohl es mir augenblicklich unmöglich ist, Beweismaterial dafür vorzulegen. Ebenso ist es nahezu sicher, dass umgekehrt auch die Fechtübungen der römischen Kavallerie ähnlich denen der neueren Zeit und analog denen der Legionsinfanterie am starren Holzpferd und Holzpfeil begannen, um über die erwähnten Zwischenstufen<sup>55</sup> in der Armatur zu enden. Auch sie war, wie Claudian zeigt<sup>56</sup> im ausgehenden Altertum noch lebendig. Doch das gehört bereits zur Sonderausbildung für eine bestimmte Waffengattung, der die dafür aussersehnen Rekruten intensiv sicher erst nach Absolvierung des allgemeinen Ausbildungskurses unterzogen wurden. Bis dahin waren noch vier Übungen durchzumachen, von denen Vegetius i. 19 zunächst den Gepäckmarsch erwähnt: Danach mussten die Rekruten ein Gewicht von etwa 60 Pfund tragen, da sich bei schwierigen Unternehmungen für sie die Notwendigkeit ergeben konnte, Proviant und Waffen gleichzeitig zu tragen. Eine Übung, die schon seit altersher in Kraft war.

Es ist nicht nötig hervorzuheben, dass das Gewicht des Marschgepäcks ein Maßstab für die Disziplinierung einer Truppe, beziehungsweise eines ganzen Heeres sein kann, besonders, wenn das Menschenmaterial physisch weniger dazu geeignet ist. Dieser Fall liegt zweifellos beim römischen Heer vor, soweit zunächst der typische Nationalrömer in Betracht

<sup>54</sup> *Bibliothek der Unterhaltung und des Wissens*, VI (1903), S. 229 f.

<sup>55</sup> Als Beweis dafür, zumindest für den Einzelkampf von Mann gegen Mann, kann der Fries eines Grabsteines von Magdalenenberg beim Zollfeld in Kärnten gewertet werden. Auf ihm sind zwei Reiter dargestellt, die sich übungshalber bekämpfen (*CIL*, III, 4858, und H. Hofmann, a.a.O., S. 16).

<sup>56</sup> *De VI. consul. Honor.* 621–39; Pollack, a.a.O.

kommt. Schwierig ist nur die Frage, welche Höhe das Gewicht seines Marschgepäcks erreicht hat. Denn bei den 60 Pfund, das sind ungefähr 20 kg.,<sup>57</sup> die Vegetius angibt, ist es nicht klar, ob sie die Gesamtbelastung darstellen, oder nur das Gewicht bedeuten, das der Rekrut ausser Kleidung und Waffen noch zu tragen hatte. Für letztere Auffassung spricht allerdings der Umstand, dass die Rekruten seit den Übungen mit den Waffen an das Tragen derselben bereits gewöhnt waren und, wie gezeigt, wahrscheinlich jede folgende Übung nur mehr in Waffen ausgeführt wurde. Demnach müssten die 20 kg. als zusätzliches Gewicht betrachtet werden, das bei schwierigen Unternehmungen von ihnen noch in Kauf zu nehmen war. In diesem Sinn wurde auch lange Zeit die Stelle aufgefasst und es ergaben sich so unter Berücksichtigung aller anderen Zeugnisse der Überlieferung Normalhöchstbelastungen von 40–50 kg.<sup>58</sup> Es ist verständlich, dass militärische Fachleute gegen solche Feststellungen Einspruch erhoben, zumal in den neuzeitlichen Heeren das Normalhöchstmaß der Belastung, ohne an Schlagkraft zu verlieren, kaum mehr als 30 kg. beträgt. Ja, das gewöhnliche Mass derselben kommt heute immer mehr weit unter dieses Gewicht zu stehen, da die Entwicklung auf die grösstmögliche Beweglichkeit des Heeresorganismus abzielt. Auch die kritische Nachprüfung der erwähnten Berechnungen, wie der Zeugnisse, auf die sie sich stützen, zeigt, dass eine Last von 40–50 kg. in keiner Weise als sicher fundiert bezeichnet werden kann. So kommen Delbrück<sup>59</sup> und G. Veith<sup>60</sup> auf ungefähr 30

<sup>57</sup> Nach Nissen, "Novaesium," *Bonner Jahrbücher*, CXI (1904), S. 15 ff., genau 19,647 kg.

<sup>58</sup> Nissen, a.a.O.; Fr. Stolle, *Der römische Legionär und sein Gepäck* (Strassburg, 1914), S. 52 und 66; und H. Delbrück, *Geschichte der Kriegskunst*, II<sup>1</sup> (Berlin, 1921), S. 479.

<sup>59</sup> A.a.O., I<sup>2</sup> (Berlin, 1920), S. 459 f. und II<sup>1</sup>, S. 476 ff.

<sup>60</sup> Kromayer-Veith, a.a.O., S. 423 ff.

kg. Dagegen lässt sich zunächst einwenden, dass es immer gewagt ist, moderne Gegebenheiten in weit zurückliegende Zeitperioden zu übertragen. Die antiken Kampfmethoden haben nicht im entferntesten jene Beweglichkeit erfordert, wie sie heute als selbstverständlich gilt und zwischen Schlagkraft von jetzt und damals ist ein grosser Unterschied. Ferner ist erwiesen, dass in der Zeit, als die neuzeitlichen Armeen aus leicht begreiflichen Gründen mit allen Mitteln des Trainings die Tragfähigkeit des Soldaten zu steigern suchten, also in den letzten Jahrzehnten des vorigen Jahrhunderts 30 kg. wesentlich überholt wurden.<sup>61</sup> So trug damals der Soldat der Schweiz rund 35 kg. und der russische fast 38. Nach David King soll der französische Fremdenlegionär im ersten Weltkrieg mit 45 kg. belastet gewesen sein und nach Sulser können und müssen die Gebirgsmitrailleure sogar 50 kg. tragen.<sup>62</sup> Schliesslich sind auch, wie Vegetius, die anderen Quellenzeugnisse nicht eindeutig, d.h., sie können, müssen aber nicht so ausgelegt und gewertet werden, wie es Delbrück und Veith tun, um zu einer Normalhöchstbelastung von rund 30 kg. zu kommen.

Man wird daher noch immer mit der Möglichkeit rechnen müssen, dass der römische Soldat zumindest, wie Stolle<sup>63</sup> errechnet hat, gegen 40 kg. getragen haben kann. Das bestreitet auch Delbrück<sup>64</sup> nicht, während nach Veith<sup>65</sup> "die Umstände, unter welchen dies nötig geworden sein sollte, ebenso schwer zu verstehen sind, als die Möglichkeit ihnen Rechnung

<sup>61</sup> Im Gegensatz zu Veith, a.a.O., S. 423.

<sup>62</sup> Neumann, "Kritische Beiträge zur römischen Heeresdisziplin," *Klio*, XXVIII (1935), S. 300 f.

<sup>63</sup> A.a.O., S. 52. Genau kommt Stolle auf 41,259 kg. Dieses Gewicht ist jedoch, wie bereits Veith (a.a.O., S. 423, Ann. 7) feststellt, korrekturbedürftig, da die gegebenen Zahlen für Rüstung, Waffen usw. nur annähernd richtig sein können.

<sup>64</sup> A.a.O., I<sup>3</sup>, S. 460.

<sup>65</sup> A.a.O., S. 424.

zu tragen." Demgegenüber ist auf die vielen Fälle zu verweisen, in denen die antike Kriegsführung mit Verpflegsnachsuschwierigkeiten zu rechnen hatte und nachweislich auch gerechnet hat.

Aber auch die andere Deutungsmöglichkeit der Vegetiusstelle, auf die sich beispielsweise E. Kalinka<sup>66</sup> stützt und demzufolge die Gesamtbelaustung des römischen Soldaten bei schwierigen Unternehmungen 20 kg. betragen hätte, ist nur hypothetisch zu werten, da sich eine widerspruchslöse Lösung im Zusammenhang mit den anderen Quellenzeugnissen nicht ergibt.

Ein klares Resultat ist also in keinem Fall möglich. Vielmehr muss mit mehreren Möglichkeiten gerechnet werden, d.h., das von der marianschen Reform zur Entlastung des Trains festgelegte Normalhöchstgewicht muss in einem Spielraum von 20–40 kg. gesucht werden. Welche Zahl nun auch den Tatsachen entspricht, in jedem Fall haben wir es mit einer sehr guten Leistung zu tun, die umso mehr ins Gewicht fällt, als der Südländer körperlich weniger dazu befähigt war.

So bewirkte die Heeresreform des Marius auch in diesem Punkt eine schärfere Disziplinierung des römischen Heeres, obwohl diese Belastung nur für Ausnahmsfälle berechnet war, daher in der Regel bloss als Exerzierübung in Betracht kam und der römische Soldat meistens weit weniger trug, besonders dann, wenn schnelle Operationen und grosse Schlagkraft erforderlich waren.

Die zweite Frage, die sich sofort aufdrängt, ist die, wie gross die Strecke war, die die Rekruten mit diesem Gepäck übungshalber zurücklegen mussten. Wir erfahren aus Vegetius bloss, dass dabei im militärischen Schritt und offenbar in For-

<sup>66</sup> "Das römische Kriegswesen in Cäsars galischen Kämpfen," Anhang zu C. *Julii Caesaris commentarii de bello Gallico* von J. Prammer und A. Kappelmacher (Leipzig-Wien, 1908), S. 234.

mation marschiert wurde, nicht aber die Weite des Weges.

Die Beantwortung hängt natürlich ganz davon ab, für welches Gewicht des Marschgepäcks man sich entscheidet. Bei 20–25 kg. lässt sich eine Strecke von 20,000 Doppelschritten, das sind ungefähr 30 km., wie sie bei der Anfangsübung verlangt wurden, aber auch hier gemäß der erwiesenen Planmässigkeit des Kurses vorausgesetzt werden dürfen, für den Durchschnitt gut bewältigen. Bei einer höheren Belastung bis etwa 30 oder mehr Kilogramm ist natürlich eine Verkürzung der Strecke bis mindestens auf die Hälfte erforderlich, um eine von allen noch durchführbare Leistung zu erzielen. Auch dieses Mass findet sich zahlenmässig bei Vegetius i. 27 in der Schilderung der Ambulatur angegeben. Doch ist aus dem Zusammenhang nicht zu entnehmen, ob unter den 10,000 Doppelschritten die ganze oder nur die Hälfte der Strecke zu verstehen ist, die dabei zurückzulegen war. In beiden Fällen ergibt sich eine recht beachtliche Leistung, die dem römischen Rekruten und Soldaten ein schönes Zeugnis ausstellt, doch nur unter der bereits erwähnten Einschränkung zu verstehen ist.

Wichtig war ferner das Lagerschlagen,<sup>67</sup> das bei der allgemeinen Ausbildung nur insofern in Betracht kam, als es sich darum handelte, das von einem Spezialtrupp bereits ausgesuchte und nach einem festen Plan abgesteckte Lager in der denkbar kürzesten Zeit zu errichten.<sup>68</sup> Das Wichtigste dabei war die Aufführung von Wall und Graben und die Aufstellung der Zelte. Das wurde nicht nur rein technisch geübt,

<sup>67</sup> Veget. i. 21, siehe auch i. 22, 23, u. 24.

<sup>68</sup> Solche Truppenübungsplätze sind, wenn nicht alles trügt, in der Nähe des Hadrianwalls bei Great Chesters und bei Cawthorn in der Grafschaft York gefunden worden (G. Macdonald, "Forschungen im römischen Britannien 1914–28," *Deutsches Arch. Institut, Röm.-Germ. Kommission*, XIX [1929] [Frankfurt a/Main, 1930], S. 25).

sondern es kam hauptsächlich darauf an, dass der Rekrut dies in Ruhe und mit Präzision auch in Gegenwart des Feindes ausführen konnte.<sup>69</sup> Aus diesem Grund halte ich es für sehr wahrscheinlich, dass auch hier wie bei den Waffenübungen die Feindeinwirkung in irgendeiner Form improvisiert wurde, da sonst eine Erprobung auf den Ernstfall illusorisch blieb. Das Gleiche muss man auch bei der nächsten Übung annehmen, die sich mit dem Umwandeln der verschiedenen Schlachtformationen ineinander befasst. Dafür sprechen nicht nur gewisse Andeutungen in der betreffenden Schilderung des Vegetius (i. 26) selbst,<sup>70</sup> sondern auch die Stellung dieser Übung im Rahmen des ganzen Ausbildungskurses und letzten Endes die Bemerkung bei Flavius Josephus (*Bell. Iud.* iii. 5, 1), dass die Schlacht den Römern nur ein mit Blutvergiessen verbundenes Exerzier war.

Als vierter Abschnitt und Gesamtab schluss der Ausbildung folgte eine Feld dienstübung, die Vegetius (i. 27) mit folgenden Worten schildert:

Ausserdem besteht noch die alte Übung, die durch die Militärvorschriften der Kaiser Augustus und Hadrian vorgeschrieben wird, dass Kavallerie wie Infanterie dreimal im Monat eine Ambulatur machen müssen. Mit diesem Wort nämlich wird diese Art der Übung bezeichnet. Dabei soll die Infanterie bewaffnet und ausgerüstet mit allen Waffen 10,000 Doppelschritte im militärischen Schritt aus dem Lager und wieder ins Lager zurückmarschieren, und zwar so, dass ein bestimmter Teil des Weges im besonders schnellen Lauf zurückgelegt wird. Auch die Kavallerie, eingeteilt in Turmen und ähnlich bewaffnet, pflegt einen ebenso grossen Marsch zu machen, und zwar derart, dass sie nach Reiterart einmal verfolgt, dann wieder zurückweicht und nach einem gewissen Rücklauf wieder Angriffe vorbereitet. Aber

<sup>69</sup> Veget. i. 25.

<sup>70</sup> Z.B.: "Tunc praecipiendum, ut subito duplicit aciem ita ut in ipso impetu sis, ad quem respondere solent, ordo servetur."

nicht nur auf Ebenen zu marschieren, sondern auch an schroffen und steilen Orten ab- und anzusteigen, wurde jede von beiden Schlachtreihen gezwungen, damit den Kämpfenden nicht etwas geschehen kann, was gute Soldaten vorher nicht durch unausgesetzte Übung gelernt haben.

An diesem Text fällt zunächst auf, dass das Wort Rekrut nicht vorkommt und es fast so aussieht, als ob die Ambulatur überhaupt nicht mehr zur Rekrutenausbildung gehörte. Vergegenwärtigt man sich aber nochmals den bisherigen Verlauf der Ausbildung und vergleicht man damit das zwar lückenhafte, aber doch noch deutliche Bild des Vegetius von der Ambulatur, dann wird sofort klar, dass diese sich nicht nur auf voll ausgebildete Soldaten bezog, sondern gleichzeitig den Abschluss der Rekrutenausbildung darstellen musste. Denn was auch immer der Rekrut während des Kurses gelernt hatte, scheint hier zur Anwendung gelangt zu sein. Vegetius führt wohl nicht alles an, aber aus dem was er bringt, ersieht man, dass die Ambulatur kein gewöhnlicher Ausmarsch war, sondern ein richtiges Manöver mit regelrechten Kampfszenen<sup>71</sup> unter Einsatz offenbar aller Waffen<sup>72</sup> und unter Berücksichtigung wahrscheinlich aller der Fälle, die sich im Kriege am häufigsten ergaben. Auch die angeführte Zahl von 10,000 Doppelschritten muss nicht ausserhalb des Rahmens fallen, da sie nicht unbedingt die gesamte, sondern nur die Hälfte der Wegstrecke bedeuten kann.<sup>73</sup> Denn die Ent-

<sup>71</sup> Das bezieht sich bei Vegetius zunächst auf die Kavallerie, muss aber auch bei der Infanterie vorausgesetzt werden. Andererseits glaube ich, dass Ausdrücke wie *utraque acies* und *pugnantibus* sich nicht anders gut, als durch arrangierte Kampfhandlungen erklären lassen. Siehe auch W. Schurz, a.a.O., in dem Abschnitt "Militärische Ausbildung unter Decuriones."

<sup>72</sup> "Armati instructaque telis pedites . . ." und weiter unten "equites . . . armaticque similiter."

<sup>73</sup> Diese Auffassung teilt auch Sulser, a.a.O., S. 32. Unhaltbar ist jedoch seine Vermutung, dass die Veget. i. 9 erwähnte Eilmarschübung überhaupt nicht reglementmäßig vorgesehen war, sondern offenbar eine Generalisierung des Vegetius darstellt, da dieser sie

fernern von 20,000 Doppelschritten hatten die Rekruten bereits bei der Übung im militärischen Schritt und vielleicht auch beim Gepäckmarsch zurückzulegen. Doch gebe ich zu, dass sich dies aus dem Text nicht mit Sicherheit folgern lässt.<sup>74</sup> Und noch in einem anderen Punkte ergibt sich Klarheit. Da an der Ambulatur auch die Kavallerie teilnahm, so ist mit grosser Wahrscheinlichkeit anzunehmen, dass die Sonderausbildung der für diese Waffengattung bestimmten Rekruten frühestens unmittelbar nach den Übungen am Pferd eingesetzt haben muss, und mit dem allgemeinen Ausbildungskurse parallel lief. Doch dürfte sie bis zum Abschluss der allgemeinen Ausbildung bloss vorbereitender als intensiver Art gewesen sein. Ein schneidiger Vorbeimarsch vor dem Ausbildungsstab beendigte wahrscheinlich den Kurs.<sup>75</sup>

Das Gesamtbild, das sich vom Schema der Grundausbildung im römischen Heer auf Grund der Darlegungen des Vegetius und der erschlossenen Ergänzungen ergibt, ist somit folgendes:

Die römische Rekrutenausbildung war in vier Abschnitte eingeteilt. Der erste umfasste Übungen im Marschieren und in der Bildung der Formationen, Laufen, Springen, Schwimmen und ihre verschiedenen militärischen Anwendungsarten. Bei der Übung im Marschieren mussten 20,000 Doppelschritte in 5 Sommerstunden, im gewöhnlichen und im Eilschritt zur gleichen Zeit 24,000 zurückgelegt wer-

i. 27 nicht wieder anführt. In diesem Falle wäre es sehr merkwürdig, woher Vegetius die Zahl von 24,000 Doppelschritten, die er i. 9 vermerkt, genommen hätte und andererseits ist zu bedenken, dass i. 27 auch andere Übungen unerwähnt blieben, die zweifellos bei der Ambulatur zur Anwendung gelangten.

<sup>74</sup> Im Gegensatz zu Sulser, a.a.O., S. 32; und Lammiert, RE, XIV (1930), Sp. 1976.

<sup>75</sup> Dass eine Deffilierung bei der Armatur üblich war, ist durch Claudian *De VI. consul. Honor.* 621-39 erwiesen und wird bei der alles zusammenfassenden Felddienstübung gleichfalls anzunehmen sein.

den. Alle Übungen des ersten Teiles wurden anfangs ohne Waffen und ohne nennenswerte Belastung ausgeführt. Der zweite Abschnitt beinhaltete die Waffenübungen, und zwar Fechten mit dem Schwert, Armaturübungen, Speerwerfen, Schiessen mit gewöhnlichen und bleivergossenen Pfeilen und Werfen von Steinen und Bleikörpern aus der Hand und mit der Schleuder. Das Fechten mit dem Schwert und das Speerwerfen wurde mit Übungswaffen, die schwerer waren, als die im Kampf verwendeten, zunächst gegen einen Holzpfahl geübt, wobei der Kopf des Gegners durch eine Verdickung des Pfahls oder einen Visierhelm angedeutet war. Von dieser Übung gegen den Pfahl ging man zum Scheinkampf von Mann gegen Mann und schliesslich zu dem ganzer Abteilungen über. Dieser Massenschein-kampf, der nichts anderes als die Rekonstruktion des stehenden Gefechtes war, bildete das ursprüngliche Wesen der Armatur. Die übrigen Waffenübungen wurden gleichfalls am Pfahl eingeübt, wobei je nach der Entfernung die Geschossart wechselte. Der dritte Ausbildungsabschnitt brachte Übungen am Pferd, im Gepäckmarschieren, Lagerschlagen und im Umwandeln der verschiedenen Formationen ineinander. Die kavalleristische Übung bezog sich auf Spring- und Sitzübungen am hölzernen und lebenden Pferd, denen ein gewisser Reitunterricht folgte. Dabei schied man wahrscheinlich jene Rekruten aus, die sich für die Kavallerie als besonders geeignet erwiesen und führte sie einer Sonderausbildung zu, die bis zum Abschluss der allgemeinen vermutlich nur vorbereitender Natur war. Beim Lagerschlagen und Umwandeln der verschiedenen Formationen ineinander kam es hauptsächlich darauf an, dass alles in kürzester Zeit auch unter Feindeinwirkung klappte. Deshalb muss dabei die

Improvisierung derselben in irgendeiner Form angenommen werden. Der vierte Abschnitt fasste alles bisher Durchgenommene in einer Felddienstübung zusammen, die mit einem Vorbeimarsch abschloss. Mit Beginn der Waffenübungen wurden auch die Übungen des ersten Ausbildungsabschnittes in Waffen ausgeführt und in der Regel auch bei allen folgenden getragen. Seit dem Marschieren mit vollem Gepäck kam auch dieses, wo es zweckmässig und durchführbar war, noch mit hinzu.

Damit ist die Planmässigkeit dieser römischen Rekrutenausbildung, die auch sonst in die Augen springt, wohl deutlich unterstrichen. Ebenso ist ihre Geschlossenheit so auffallend, dass Vegetius, auch wenn er vergleichend arbeitete, ein einziges Reglement als Grundlage genommen haben kann. Dass dieses nur das hadrianische sein dürfte, geht aus den zeitlichen Festlegungen hervor, zu denen ich gekommen bin.

Danach ist nicht nur die Einführung des Gladiatorenfechtens im römischen Heer und die Normierung des Marschgepäcks mit der marianischen Heeresreform im Verbindung zu bringen, sondern auch die Unterweisung der Legionäre im Pfeilschiessen, im Schleudern von Steinen und Bleigeschossen und im Kavalleriedienst. Die Felddienstübung geht wahrscheinlich auf Augustus und das Schiessen mit bleivergossenen Pfeilen auf Hadrian zurück. Alle anderen Übungen sind vormarianisch und dürfen allgemein als Teile jener Ausbildungsschemen gelten, die vom Zeitpunkt an, als es überhaupt eine geregelte Rekrutenausbildung bei den Römern gab, in Kraft waren. Da das hadrianische Armeereglement das augusteische und dieses wiederum wahrscheinlich das marianische zur Grundlage hatte, so dürfte das von Vegetius skizzierte Schema der römischen Rekrutenausbildung den ha-

drianischen Heeresbestimmungen entnommen sein.

Diese zeitliche Verteilung der einzelnen Übungen ermöglicht aber auch—and damit komme ich zum Hauptpunkt der Untersuchung—wichtige Schlussfolgerungen hinsichtlich der römischen Heeresdisziplin. Denn da sicher nicht viele Legionäre die für das Gladiatorenfechten, Pfeilschiessen, Schleudern und die kavalleristische Grundausbildung erforderliche körperliche Veranlagung und Geschicklichkeit besasssen, ist klar, dass hier nur durch unaufhörlichen Drill befriedigende Erfolge erzielt werden konnten. Dasselbe gilt für den Gepäckmarsch und das Schiessen mit bleivergossenen Pfeilen. Damit musste sich aber eine schärfere Disziplinierung des römischen Heeres als bisher ergeben.

Sie wurde auch dadurch bewirkt, dass die neu hinzugekommenen Übungen an sich schon eine Mehrbelastung darstellten, die keineswegs unterschätzt werden darf, auch wenn das jeweils bis dahin gültige Schema der Grundausbildung eine gute Basis dafür bot. Natürlich nur dann, wenn es eingehalten wurde. Wie weit das aber der Fall war, lässt sich im einzelnen erst nach der Untersuchung der Spezialbeziehungsweise Soldatenausbildung beurteilen. Allgemein jedoch muss man bedenken, dass, seitdem es ein römisches Heer gab, wohl Übungen nach einem, wenn auch anfangs nur mündlich überlieferten Reglement regelmäßig stattgefunden haben müssen. Das geht schon allein aus Veget. i. 10 hervor und ist auch bei der schwierigen Situation in der sich der römische Staat in den Anfängen seiner Entwicklung den Nachbarstaaten gegenüber befand, von vornherein anzunehmen. Doch können diese Übungen nicht be-

sonders intensiv gewesen sein. Denn das römische Heer trat bis zu den ersten Anzeichen der Entwicklung zum stehenden meistens erst unmittelbar vor und während eines Feldzuges voll in Erscheinung.<sup>76</sup> In einer so verhältnismässig kurzen Zeit aber, war es nicht nur unmöglich, ein in jeder Beziehung straff durchdiszipliniertes und jeder Eventualität gewachsenes Heer zu schaffen, sondern auch die Ausbildung der Rekruten konnte kaum in der Weise erfolgen, dass sie für die zu erwartenden Ausfälle einen vollen Ersatz versprach. Ein Nachteil, der in der Gliederung nach *hastati*, *principes* und *triarii* auch äusserlich zum Ausdruck kam und sich anfangs, als mit der ersten Schlacht der Feldzug schon entschieden war, natürlich noch nicht nennenswert fühlbar machen konnte. Erst mit dem stehenden Heer, das faktisch schon lange vor Augustus bestand, waren die Voraussetzungen für eine intensive Schulung der Rekruten und Soldaten gegeben, die freilich wie zu allen Zeiten auch jetzt von den jeweiligen besonderen Verhältnissen abhängig war. Am Ende des vierten nachchristlichen Jahrhunderts verlor mit dem vielleicht schon etwas früher nur mehr als Aufzeichnung noch bestehenden nationalen Heeresreglement für die westliche Reichshälfte auch das Schema der römischen Rekrutenausbildung im bisherigen Sinn fast jede praktische Bedeutung. Nur die Armatur, die Übung am hölzernen Pferd und die Felddienstübung blieben zur Zeit des Vegetius noch lebendig.<sup>77</sup>

#### WIEN

<sup>76</sup> Daran hat auch die nach Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, III, S. 1073 ff., ziemlich früh eingesetzende ständige Heerbildung nicht viel geändert, wenn auch damit eine Verbesserung der Ausbildung und Disziplin verbunden gewesen sein muss.

<sup>77</sup> Vgl. auch R. Grosse, a.a.O., S. 261.

## EURIPIDES' TELEPHUS AND THE THESMOPHO- RIAZUSAE OF ARISTOPHANES

HAROLD W. MILLER

**E**URIPIDES, in 438 B.C., exhibited a tragedy based on the myth of the Mysian hero, Telephus, which was destined in later years to exert a remarkable influence upon Aristophanes in the composition of several of his comedies. For some reason which cannot now be fully perceived, this tragedy, which must have been presented when Aristophanes was still extremely young,<sup>1</sup> seems to have made a profound impression upon Aristophanes; for when, thirteen years later, the comic poet produced his *Acharnians*, he imitated the structure, the language, and the actions of the *Telephus* closely and extensively.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, this tragedy of Euripides was parodied by Aristophanes in the surviving comedies more often than any other,<sup>3</sup> and in the last as well as in the first extant comedy, for Aristophanes seemingly never wearied of deriding the *Telephus*. So familiar was he with this

<sup>1</sup> Speculations that Aristophanes was born earlier than the traditional date of 445 B.C. have not proved very acceptable (cf. R. G. Kent, *CR*, XIX [1905], 153 ff.; Koerte in Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, CLII [1911], 281; Kaibel in *RE*, s.v. "Aristophanes"; Wilamowitz, *Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad., phil.-hist. Kl.*, 1911, p. 461).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. W. H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen, *De parodia in comoediis Aristophanis* (*Traject ad Rhenum*, 1877), pp. 1-27. In the commentary of his edition of the *Acharnians*, Starkie has brilliantly and very completely indicated the relationship between the *Telephus* and the *Acharnians*, with reference to the structure, the action, and the language. No other extant comedy of Aristophanes so broadly and consistently imitates the language and action of a tragedy.

<sup>3</sup> Bakhuyzen (*op. cit.*) lists in his Index eighteen references in eight of the comedies to passages which parody the *Telephus* very closely in language, as the evidence clearly proves. But this statement gives an inadequate idea of the extensiveness of Aristophanes, use of the tragedy, for many of the citations contain several parodies and Bakhuyzen did not fully treat parody of situation and action. Starkie and other commentators have pointed out many additional places, passed over by Bakhuyzen, where the *Telephus*-inspired Aristophanes in the composition of the *Acharnians*.

tragedy and so much of its language and action did he incorporate into his comedies that his parodies of it are actually the primary sources for the reconstruction of Euripides' tragedy.

That Aristophanes introduced into the *Thesmophoriazusae* an abundance of Euripidean parodies has, of course, long been known. Beginning especially with line 765, the comedy consists very largely of direct quotations, parodies of varying degree of preciseness, and paratragoedia of the language and action, of the *Palamedes*, the *Helen*, and the *Andromeda* of Euripides, the latter two having been only recently produced. In fact, in the three scenes in which these tragedies are parodied, Aristophanes utilized Euripidean tragedy in his composition probably more directly and more extensively than in any other surviving comedy. In the earlier portion of the comedy also, brief, isolated, and quite exact parodies of several tragedies have been identified, and the presence of much tragic imitation of a more general nature has been noted. But it has not yet been observed that Aristophanes in composing the first half of the *Thesmophoriazusae* was probably influenced, as a considerable number of indications strongly suggest, by the structure and action of another much older tragedy of Euripides, the *Telephus*.<sup>4</sup> The influence

<sup>4</sup> The scholiast identifies Th. 518-19 as being from the *Telephus*; and Bakhuyzen (*op. cit.*, pp. 17 ff.), in his study of parody in one scene of the *Acharnians*, points out the probability that several lines in Mnesilochus' speech beginning with Th. 466 are parodies of the *Telephus*. The various editors and commentators on the comedy scarcely mention the *Telephus*. Thus Rogers, in his discussion of the parodies in the comedy in the Introduction to his edition, gives a full account of the parodies of the three other plays of Euripides but disregards the *Telephus*.

of this tragedy extends also, I think, to the language of the comedy in not a few passages, though it may be granted that the paucity of the fragments of the tragedy makes a precise estimation of the influence of the *Telephus* with reference to verbal parody impossible. However, a careful analysis of the dramatic structure of the *Thesmophoriazusae* up to line 765, along with a comparative examination of the structure of the *Telephus*, reveals that the basic structure of the earlier part of the comedy, the action and the order of the scenes, exclusive of the scenes introduced extraneously for purely comic purposes,<sup>5</sup> is extraordinarily similar<sup>6</sup> to that of Euripides' tragedy. Complementary to the recognition of this resemblance of dramatic structure, it seems possible to detect additional passages in the comedy in which the language has been inspired by lines of the *Telephus*. Some of these verses are probably parodic (though not all are identifiable beyond doubt), while others seem to have been composed by Aristophanes in paratragoedia. Others, lacking tragic style and language, yet contain an idea which seems to have been suggested by passages of Euripides' famous play.

Although the fragments of the *Telephus* are neither extremely numerous nor ex-

<sup>5</sup> As, e.g., the verses of Agathon's servant (40–57) composed by Aristophanes in ridicule of Agathon; Agathon's ode (101–29), which has the same motivation; and Mnesilochus' conversation with Agathon (130–72). Such scenes were inserted purely *τέλεστα* and are extrinsic to the structural framework and action of the comedy.

<sup>6</sup> The correspondence between the *Telephus* and the *Thesmophoriazusae* will be seen to be greater actually with respect to the structure and the action of the two plays than between the *Telephus* and the *Acharnians*. To cite one instance: Mnesilochus in *Th.* 689 ff. seizes the "infant" as a hostage, after his disguise has failed, following the plot of the tragedy exactly. But Dicaeopolis in *Ach.* 325 ff. seizes the hostage there not after, but before, his defense, and the motive for his action is not self-protection but to secure the right to make a defense. Here in the *Acharnians* the order and the motivation of the action in the tragedy are departed from considerably.

tensive, comparatively complete reconstruction<sup>7</sup> of the tragedy has proved to be possible, and there is almost certain agreement as to the main features of the action and structure of the play. The reconstruction of the plot of the tragedy, with an accompanying examination of the corresponding scenes of the *Acharnians* generally accepted as parodying the tragedy, has been used as the basis of this study, and a scene-by-scene comparison of the *Telephus* and the *Thesmophoriazusae*, as far as feasible, is presented to reveal the elements common to the two plays. The fundamental similarity of action and structure may be described thus in advance: in the earlier part of the *Thesmophoriazusae*, Euripides at first and afterward Mnesilochus (acting as Euripides' proxy),<sup>8</sup> parody the role of Telephus in Euripides' tragedy and perform very much the same actions as that hero. That the role of Euripides in the comedy is modeled after that of Telephus is, admittedly, less obvious than in the case of Mnesilochus; but all considerations make it, I think, unmis-

<sup>7</sup> For reconstructions of the *Telephus*, cf. F. G. Welcker, *Die griechischen Tragoedien* (Leipzig, 1839–41), pp. 477–92; J. A. Hartung, *Euripides restitutus* (Hamburg, 1844), I, 196–216; N. Wecklein, *Sitzungsber. Münchener Akad., phil.-hist. Kl.*, 1878, II, 198–223, also *ibid.*, 1909, Abh. 1; C. Pilling, *Quomodo Telephi fabulam et scriptores et artifices veteres tractaverint* (Halle, 1886), pp. 49–60; Nauck, *TGF*, pp. 579 ff.; Wilamowitz, *Berliner Klassikertexte*, V (1907), Part II, 69 ff.; W. J. M. Starkie, *Acharnians*, Excursus VI, pp. 248–51; Louis Séchan, *Études sur la tragédie grecque* (Paris, 1926), pp. 512–18; D. L. Page, *Greek Literary Papyri* ("Loeb Classical Library"), I (1942), 130 ff.; cf. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, in *New Chapters in Greek Literature, Third Series*, ed. J. U. Powell (Oxford, 1933), pp. 79 ff. Of these, Starkie's reconstruction (based on those of his predecessors), though in outline form, is most illuminating. Throughout this paper, the account of the action in the various scenes of the *Telephus* has been based on these sources.

<sup>8</sup> The presence of Mnesilochus in the first part of the play (1–279) in addition to Euripides does not, except superficially, destroy the similarity of Euripides' role to that of Telephus. As Euripides himself explains (189–90), it is impossible that he should himself go to the *Thesmophoria*, and it is natural that Mnesilochus should therefore accompany Euripides, since the plot of the comedy will demand his presence before the action has proceeded very far.

takable. It is my belief that Aristophanes consciously<sup>9</sup> modeled the two roles upon the role of Telephus in Euripides' tragedy, just as in the *Acharnians* the role of Dicaeopolis is very clearly modeled, though with some modification, upon that of Euripides' hero. This would have the natural result that the dramatic structure of the tragedy and the comedy assumed much the same form. If it seems incredible that Aristophanes, so many years after the exhibition of the *Telephus*, could be so largely affected by it in the composition of the *Thesmophoriazusae*, it may be pointed out that the imitations of the situations and actions of the tragedy in at least three scenes of the comedy seem established beyond any doubt whatever. The inference from this would be that the *Telephus* was in Aristophanes' mind as he composed the whole first portion of the comedy, a circumstance which would make it easy for the tragedy to exert an influence upon other early scenes in the comedy where the relationship to the *Telephus* is perhaps less extensive and direct and, accordingly, less obvious to us, the loss of the tragedy not permitting direct verification. This situation would also at the same time make it natural for Aristophanes to be affected by the language of the *Telephus*. It is not, of course, to be anticipated that the correspondence to and similarity with the tragedy will be exact and perfect<sup>10</sup> in all respects or that

<sup>9</sup> It is impossible to determine to what extent Aristophanes may have been unconsciously influenced by his obviously very great familiarity with the *Telephus*, nor how much he was affected, if at all, in the composition of the *Thesmophoriazusae* by the *Acharnians* and the early parody of the *Telephus* contained in it. But the different manner in which he introduced in both his comedies a parody of the same scene (see n. 5) suggests a fresh and conscious parody of the *Telephus*.

<sup>10</sup> As, for example, the correspondence between the *Telephus* and the *Acharnians*, which is universally admitted to parody the tragedy, is very far from being exact. On the contrary, the order of scenes is changed, and new elements are inserted as necessitated by the comic plot.

Aristophanes would fail to introduce some new features into the plot of the *Thesmophoriazusae*, since a parody, regardless of how close the composer intends it to be, can hardly follow its original completely, especially if the parody is extensive.

The *Telephus* opens with a Prologue, recited by Telephus before the palace of Agamemnon at Argos, to which place, upon the advice of Delphi, the Mysian hero, disguised as a beggar, had come seeking a cure of the wound which he had received from Achilles when the Greeks had landed in Mysia by mistake on the way to Troy. Now the *Thesmophoriazusae* has no prologue, and the opening scene (1-38) is a comic philosophical diatribe and a comic exchange between Euripides and Mnesilochus, which Aristophanes composed *de novo* and without any apparent reference to the Prologue of the tragedy. By way of contrast, the first scene of the *Acharnians*, consisting of the monologue of Dicaeopolis, seems clearly to have been modeled<sup>11</sup> upon the Prologue of the *Telephus* and probably includes much, though not now identifiable, verbal parody. However, the *Thesmophoriazusae* in this scene betrays no immediate relationship to the Prologue of the *Telephus* with, I think, the important exception of Euripides' dramatic situation. For Euripides, like Telephus, is discovered lurking before a dwelling whose occupant he intends to importune to secure a favor. Thus Euripides in the opening scene of the *Thesmophoriazusae* and Telephus, so far as the plots of the two plays are concerned, are in essentially the same dramatic situation. And the events which

<sup>11</sup> For the verbal parody and similarity of Dicaeopolis' monologue to the Prologue of the *Telephus*, cf. Starkie's commentary on Ach. 1-42 and Excursus VI, and P. Mazon, *Essai sur la composition des comédies d'Aristophane* (Paris, 1904), p. 15. It may be noted, however, that Dicaeopolis is far from being in the same situation dramatically as Telephus. As far as situation is concerned, Euripides in the *Thesmophoriazusae* is closer to the *Telephus* of the original.

hinge upon this situation will prove to issue in a similar manner. Furthermore, the continuation of the opening scene in the comedy, after the Servant's interruption, will provide some probable specific resemblances to the Prologue of the *Telephus*.

The action of the second scene of Euripides' tragedy is somewhat uncertain in its details, owing to the scarcity of the fragments. But Telephus attempted to gain entrance to the palace, where some of the Greek heroes were assembled, discussing the course of the war and their repulse in Mysia. Perhaps he asked to see some one of the heroes, but the Servant, who had come out from the palace,<sup>12</sup> refused to allow him to enter. This scene is represented in the *Acharnians* by the scene between Euripides' servant and Dicaeopolis (393–406), in which the Servant comes out in response to Dicaeopolis' summons, Dicaeopolis asks him to call Euripides out, and his request is refused. In the *Thesmophoriazusae* (39–70), a scene of similar action is encountered between Agathon's servant and Euripides (and Mnesilochus, whose presence is made necessary by the exigencies of the plot of the comedy), in which the action proceeds as in the *Telephus* and in the corresponding scene in the *Acharnians*. Here Euripides urges the Servant to call Agathon (64–65) forth, but the plea in a sense, at least, is rejected (66–67), just as the requests of

Telephus and Dicaeopolis were denied. There is, of course, much included in this scene for comic purposes, completely unconnected with any possible influence of the *Telephus*, such as the Servant's verses in his master's style (43–57) and Mnesilochus' raillery of the Servant. But this procedure in composition by Aristophanes is by no means uncommon, for purely comic passages are intermingled in the most directly parodic scenes quite regularly. The Servant's lines are for the most part "aggravated" and elevated in style.<sup>13</sup> There are, further, two lines which may with reason be considered to be imitative of the *Telephus*. The Servant's question: *τις ἀγρούτας πελάθει θρυγκοῖς*; (58) is elevated and tragic<sup>14</sup> and may be conjectured to correspond to a question of similar import which the action of the *Telephus* would demand. Euripides' request: *σὺ δὲ | Ἀγάθωνά μοι δένρ' ἐκκάλεσον πάση τέχνη* (64–65) is not tragic in style, but it is the same request made, more briefly, by Dicaeopolis (*Ach.* 402) in the corresponding scene, which suggests that both may be based on the similar action of the *Telephus*. The language of these two verses cannot, however, with any claim of certainty be stated to be parodic. The point of most significance here is the similarity in the development of the action in the *Telephus* and in the two comedies.

With the exit of the Servant, the opening scene of the *Thesmophoriazusae* be-

<sup>12</sup> It is interesting to speculate as to the source of the similarity in the passage in *Th.* 36–39 and *Ach.* 238–41. In the former, Euripides, when he hears Agathon's servant coming out, exclaims: *ἀλλ' ἔκποδον τρίψουμεν, ως ξέρχεται | θεράπων τις . . . | προθυσόμενος, οὐκε,* *τὴ τοῖσιν. Servant: εἴθημεν τις ἄτοι λαβε κτλ.* The passage in *Acharnians*, though in a different dramatic situation, is rather similar: *σίγα πᾶτε . . . | . . . ἀλλὰ δένρο τις | ἔκποδῶν θεων γάρ ἀνήρ, ως λου', ξέρχεται. | εἰσῆμεντε,* *εἴσημεντε.* There is no fragment of the *Telephus* extant to which these two passages can be traced, but both contain tragic locutions and the action of the tragedy, after the Prologue, is the same as that at the opening scene in the *Thesmophoriazusae*. Thus it seems by no means incredible that there is some degree of imitation of the tragedy here.

<sup>13</sup> The language of Agathon's servant may be due to the desire on the part of Aristophanes to ridicule Agathon. But when Agathon's house is described with words *μελάθρων τῶν δεσποούσιων* (41) and Agathon is called a *πόδος* (50), tragic and Euripidean vocabulary is used which the Servant in *Telephus* might be expected to use in the similar situation.

<sup>14</sup> The diction of the line is poetic and tragic and foreign to Aristophanes' comic diction. Cf. the use of *πελάθει* in *Ranae* 1265 ff. *θρυγκοῖς* is especially Euripidean (only here, and repeated in line 60 for the jest, in Aristophanes), not occurring in the other tragedians or in classical prose. On the tragic force of the line, cf. J. van Leeuwen, *Thesmophoriazusae* (Leyden, 1902), *ad loc.*

tween Euripides and Mnesilochus is resumed (71–94). This scene, therefore, is a continuation of the opening scene, which was analogical in situation to the Prologue of the *Telephus*, and it is developed with considerable parallelism to that scene; for Euripides here reveals his difficulties (though not in prologue form), as *Telephus* had, and explains his plans for extricating himself. His plan of action varies in detail, as necessitated by the circumstances peculiar to the plot of the comedy, but in its general lines is the same as that of *Telephus*. Three verses with varying degrees of probability show the influence of the tragedy. Euripides' appeal:  $\delta\text{ε}\nu$ ,  $\tau\text{i δράσαι διανοεῖ με τήμερον}$  (71) can, with some confidence, be accepted as paratragoedia<sup>16</sup> of the *Telephus* because of its similarity to an appeal in the *Knights*,<sup>16</sup> which the scholiast states to be a parody of the tragedy. Because of the obviously tragic style,<sup>17</sup> several critics<sup>18</sup> seem to me to be correct in suggesting that Euripides' words:  $\tau\text{ηδε θήμερα κριθήσεται | εἰτ' ἔστ' ζητεῖς ὁν εἰτ' ἀπόλωλ' Εὐριπίδης}$  (76–77) are derived from the *Telephus*. Another line in tragic rhythm shows evidence of tragic imitation:<sup>19</sup>  $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\theta\rho\eta, στολὴν γυναικὸς \dot{\eta}\muφιεσμένον$  (92), perhaps modeled on a line from the *Telephus* concerning the hero's disguise or

suggested by the idea of his disguise. It is clear that these three passages would be extremely appropriate to the ideas which we know from other sources were contained in the *Telephus* Prologue. This receives added confirmation from a parody of a portion of the same Prologue in the *Lysistrata*.<sup>21</sup>

In the following scene of the *Telephus* the queen, Clytemnestra, comes from the palace. The hero beseeches her for aid and is befriended by her and admitted to the palace, his ultimate purpose being to present himself to the heroes in the palace. To this scene there are, I believe, counterparts in both the *Acharnians* and the *Thesmophoriazusae*, although it may be true, judging by what is perhaps inadequately known about the details of the scene in the *Telephus*, that the specific action has been somewhat altered to accord with the plots of the two comedies. In the *Acharnians* the comparable scene is that between Euripides and Dicaeopolis (406 ff.), in which Dicaeopolis begs Euripides (who has appeared by means of the ecyclema) for his aid, namely, for the rags of *Telephus* and other articles as a disguise.<sup>22</sup> The scene contains several close verbal parodies, despite the manner in which the details of the action may have been slightly modified. The comparable scene in the *Thesmophoriazusae* reveals Euripides begging Agathon (who has also made his appearance by means of the ec-

<sup>16</sup> Not, however, directly parodic, since Aristophanes alters it to use some comic diction. e.g.,  $\delta\text{ιανοεῖ}$  and  $\tau\text{ήμερον}$ .

<sup>17</sup> Ar. *Eq.* 1240 = Eur., Frag. 700 N<sup>2</sup>. Cf. a similar parodic appeal in Ar. *Pax* 62; cf. also S. *OR* 738, and frequently in tragedy. Such appeals are not common in Aristophanes.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Van Leeuwen *ad loc.* for the tragic elements in the lines; also, Bakhuizen, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Nauck, *TGF*, p. 580; Wecklein, *op. cit.*, 1878, II, 213.

<sup>20</sup> Bakhuizen (*op. cit.*, p. 112), following Fritzsche and Enger, notes the tragic tone of the line. The word  $\sigmaτολὴν$  may have been in the original line. This is suggested by the fact that in the fragments of the *Telephus* of Ennius, the hero twice speaks of his beggar's rags, using the word *stola* (cf. O. Ribbeck, *TRF*, p. 56).

<sup>21</sup> The alteration to  $\gammaυναικὸς$  would be a necessary adaptation to the plot of the *Thesmophoriazusae*.

<sup>22</sup> The despair of Euripides and his revelation of his difficulties to Mnesilochus are curiously similar to Lysistrata's conversation with the Chorus in *Lys.* 706–16. In this passage, l. 706 (= Eur., Frag. 699 N<sup>2</sup>) is from the *Telephus*, on the authority of the scholiast, and l. 707 is almost certainly from the same source (cf. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.*, p. 70 and n. 1). Line 713 is from Euripides, according to the scholiast. I have no doubt that the whole passage is partly quoted and partly imitated from the *Telephus*.

<sup>23</sup> Thus departing, in details, from the original scene, since *Telephus* was already disguised, so far as is known. Basically, however, the action of the scene accomplishes the same purposes, and it is quite possible that *Telephus* sought other articles of disguise from Clytemnestra.

yclema) for his help. The specific request that he makes is manifestly peculiar to the plot of the comedy (since Euripides cannot attend the Thesmophoria to defend himself), but it is not altogether remote from Telephus' request of Clytemnestra, which was, simply stated, her aid in helping him to save his life. When Agathon refuses to grant the request, Euripides (like Dicaeopolis in the *Acharnians*) asks for disguises, though necessarily not for himself but for Mnesilochus, his proxy. This scene in the *Thesmophoriazusae* is long (95–265), and the earlier part is purely comic and without relationship to the *Telephus*, including Agathon's ode (101–29) and the comic colloquy between Agathon and Mnesilochus (130–72). Euripides then makes his appeal to Agathon for aid, first quoting two lines from his tragedy *Aeolus* (*Th.* 177–78), and continuing with the tragic lines: ἐγὼ δὲ κανῇ ἔνμορῷ πεπληγένος | ικετής ἀφῆγμαι πρὸς σε, to which Agathon replies: τοῦ χρείαν ἔχων; (179–80).<sup>23</sup> These lines must surely be similar to the remarks Telephus addressed to the queen, even if the language cannot be shown to be a specific parody. The answer of Agathon: τίς οὖν παρ' ἡμῶν ἐστιν ὀφέλειά σοι; (183) is probably only comparable to Clytemnestra's answer and not to be considered as a parody. Agathon refuses<sup>24</sup> the request made by Euripides, couching his answer in a famous quota-

<sup>23</sup> Line 179 has been taken by some as a parody of Eur. *Alcestis* 856, to which it has some resemblance. The line is hardly distinctive, however, and some critics note the tragic tone without referring it to a specific source (cf. Bakhuizen, op. cit., p. 114, following Fritsche). Starkie has included the two lines in his reconstruction of the *Telephus*. There seems, at any rate, little doubt that the lines are Euripidean.

<sup>24</sup> With the sentiment of *Th.* 195–99, cf. Eur., Frag. 701 N<sup>2</sup> and 702 N<sup>2</sup>. We have no details of the scene in the *Telephus* to prove whether this part of the action is faithful to the original or not. But following fragments make it clear that the hero was merely admitted to the palace through the agency of Clytemnestra, not to the presence of the Greek heroes, which was his original desire. Hence the queen may have refused a part of his desire.

tion from the *Alcestis*<sup>25</sup> and then, in expanding his refusal, explains: τὰς συμφορὰς γάρ οὐχὶ τοὺς τεχνάσμασιν | φέρειν δίκαιον, ἀλλὰ τοὺς παθήμασιν (198–99), lines clearly in tragic style which perhaps are based on the *Telephus*.<sup>26</sup> Agathon does, however, readily acquiesce in lending his aid to Euripides by giving various articles for Mnesilochus' disguise, as in the case of Dicaeopolis and Euripides in the *Acharnians*. Thereafter, the business of disguising Mnesilochus is developed in comic fashion, without any trace of the verbal parody as so fully encountered in the disguising of Dicaeopolis. But the motivation of the entire scene seems quite clearly to have been inspired by the *Telephus*.<sup>27</sup>

In the next scene of the tragedy, the hero is introduced into the group of Greek warriors assembled within the palace, after he has plotted with the queen to seize the infant Orestes as a hostage, if it should prove necessary to his safety. The heroes are attacking Telephus for the part he had played in their repulse in Mysia. The disguised Telephus, in a long speech, defends himself so cleverly that at least some of the heroes are won to his side. The counterpart of this scene in the *Thesmophoriazusae* is the assembly of the women. The purpose of the assembly is to determine what should be done by the women to Euripides, their enemy, and he is as-

<sup>25</sup> *Th.* 194 = Eur. *Alcestis* 691.

<sup>26</sup> Starkie (*Acharnians*, Excursus VI, p. 251) places these lines in his reconstruction in the scene of quarreling between Telephus and Achilles, perhaps rightly, since they would seem somewhat out of place in the scene between Clytemnestra and Telephus, so far as we are aware of the action of the scene. However, the development of the action of the scene in *Thesmophoriazusae* offers a place for their use, and it is not unusual for parodies to be introduced by Aristophanes which are out of place from the point of view of the original.

<sup>27</sup> The two following short scenes in *Thesmophoriazusae*—that between Euripides and Mnesilochus (266–79), in which Euripides swears to his relative, and Mnesilochus' scene with Thratta (274–94)—have no relationship to the *Telephus* but are added for comic reasons.

sailed by two speakers for his crimes against them, just as Telephus is assailed by the Greek heroes and as Dicaeopolis is attacked in the *Acharnians*. In the first two speeches against Euripides, there is no trace of verbal parody or direct influence of the tragedy, and the development of the speeches is purely comic. Lines 466–519, however, containing Mnesilochus' defense of Euripides, correspond to the μακρὰ ρῆσις of Telephus, as well as to the defense of Dicaeopolis in the *Acharnians* (496–556).<sup>28</sup> The dramatic function of the three speeches in the plot and action of the three plays is the same. In each a disguised person pleads for his life before a hostile audience, which has just been attacking him. Mnesilochus, it is true, because of the economy of the plot of the *Thesmophoriazusae*, pleads not for his own life but for that of Euripides, whom he represents and for whom he is soon to risk his life. The ideas advanced in the three speeches, naturally diverging in detail and in the form they assume, are patterned along the same general lines. After agreeing with the previous speakers, each of the three minimizes the causes of the anger and attempts to prove that the anger of the group is without sufficient basis, since the offender could not have acted otherwise under the circumstances. A large part of Mnesilochus' speech consists, as might be expected, of a comic catalogue of evils performed by women. But the parallelism in structure of the two speeches in Aristophanes' comedies is so remarkable as to force the conclusion that both were consciously based upon the

original scene of the *Telephus*. There is, further, some indirect, but rather compelling, evidence of verbal parody in the μακρὰ ρῆσις delivered by Mnesilochus and by Dicaeopolis. This consists of several lines in the two speeches which are almost identical and occur at much the same point in the development of the speeches. The lines are entirely consistent with sentiments which must have been contained in the speech of Telephus. Thus, Mnesilochus begins by commiserating with the women and expressing no surprise that they are angry at Euripides. One expression he uses—ἐπιχεῖν τὴν χολὴν (468)—is tragic and metaphorical and certainly alien to comic diction.<sup>29</sup> The same type of expression occurs once again in Aristophanes, in the mouth of Dicaeopolis, in a scene in the *Acharnians*,<sup>30</sup> which lends some credence to the idea that the expression also occurred in the *Telephus* originally. Mnesilochus then continues: καύτῃ γάρ ἔγωγ', . . . | μισῶ τὸν ἄνδρ' ἐκεῖνον, εἰ μὴ μαίνομαι (469–70).<sup>31</sup> But, he goes on, it is necessary to discuss the matter,<sup>32</sup> as Dicaeopolis likewise had urged: αὐταὶ γάρ ἐσμεν, κοιδεμι' ἔκφορος λόγου (472).<sup>33</sup> Then, following the scheme of the

<sup>28</sup> The verb *ἐπίσκω* was Ionic in origin, whence it passed into Attic and lingered in tragedy. The word is rare, occurring once each in Herodotus, Aeschylus, and Sophocles, twice in Euripides, and only in the two places cited in Aristophanes. W. G. Rutherford (*New Phrynicus* [London, 1881], p. 17) discusses the word. It seems very unlikely that it could have occurred in comedy apart from some tragic influence.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Ach. 321: οἷον αὖ μέλας τις ὑμῖν θυμάλωψ δέκεσσε (the line contains a jest). It is true that the expression, though spoken by Dicaeopolis, does not occur in his μακρὰ ρῆσις but is addressed to the Acharnians when he is trying to persuade them to allow him to make a speech. This difference is not significant, probably, since the order of events in the comedy differs several times from that of the *Telephus*.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Ach. 509, which makes only the necessary changes to comply with the plot of the *Acharnians* (cf. Starkie, *Acharnians*, on this line, and Bakhuyzen, *op. cit.*, pp. 17 ff.).

<sup>31</sup> Th. 471 and Ach. 501 also express the same idea, although they differ in language.

<sup>32</sup> The idiom is peculiar and probably from the *Telephus*. Cf. the similar expressions in Ach. 504, 507, and Starkie's commentary on these lines.

<sup>28</sup> The speech of Dicaeopolis contains several direct parodies of the *Telephus*, as indicated by the scholiast (cf. Starkie on 496–97, 540–41, 543). Dicaeopolis' speech reveals somewhat more verbal parody than does Mnesilochus' in *Thesmophoriazusae*. On the form and content of Telephus' speech, cf. Starkie *Acharnians*, Excursus VI, p. 250, and Bakhuyzen, *op. cit.*, pp. 17 ff., as well as the other reconstructions cited above.

speech in the *Telephus*, Mnesilochus asks for what, specifically, Euripides is blamed: *τι ταῦτ' ἔχονται κεῖνον αἰτώμεθα* (473).<sup>34</sup> Thereafter, in the two comedies, the argument of the defense is treated individually and in comic fashion, but the argument attempts to prove the same thesis as that found in the *Telephus*: that Euripides, like Telephus, had done only what was necessitated by the circumstances and cannot therefore be justly blamed. The argument ends with a well-attested parody from the *Telephus*: *ταῦτ' οὐ ποιῶμεν τὰ κακά; νὴ τὴν Ἀρτέμιν, | ἡμεῖς γε. καὶ τ' Εἰριπίδη θυμούμεθα, | οὐδὲν παθοῦσαι μεῖζον η δεδράκαμεν* (517–19).<sup>35</sup> It is fully apparent, I think, that the whole conception of the speech of Mnesilochus is related vitally to that of the *μακρὰ ρῆσις* of Telephus and that the several lines quoted reveal the influence of the tragedy in their composition.

The defense of Telephus apparently persuaded Agamemnon but not all the heroes, some of whom began to threaten and upbraid Telephus. This is also the context of the scene in the *Acharnians* (557–65) after the defense of Dicaeopolis, a passage which contains several probable verbal parodies<sup>36</sup> of the *Telephus*. Similarly, after the *ρῆσις* of Mnesilochus, the scene (520–70) is one in which the women upbraid and threaten him for his defense of Euripides, though developed mostly comically. The conception of this scene therefore agrees with that of the *Telephus*, and one central idea in particular seems to derive from the original play. In a surviving fragment of the tragedy, the hero refuses to refrain from talking, even at the

risk of personal danger, since the arguments he has to present are *δίκαια*.<sup>37</sup> This idea is quite humorously parodied by Dicaeopolis in the action of the *Acharnians*, and, after his speech, the "justice" of his remarks is repeatedly stressed.<sup>38</sup> So, in this scene in the *Thesmophoriazusae*, though threatened with danger, Mnesilochus insists that it was his right to speak *ὑπὲρ Εἰριπίδου δίκαια* (542). Thus all three justify their right to speak because of the "justice" of their arguments. The answer made by the women to this claim of freedom to speak is that one *ἡτις μόνη τετληκας | ὑπὲρ ἀνόρδος ἀντεπεῖν, ὃς ἡμᾶς πολλὰ κακὰ δέδρακεν* (544–55) must be punished.<sup>39</sup> This passage thus expresses an idea which one would expect to occur, *mutatis mutandis*, in the tragic scene after the defense of Telephus. There are no identifiable direct parodies in this scene, but the same dramatic situation and action do result naturally from the *ρῆσις* of Mnesilochus in the same manner as in the corresponding scene of the original.

At this point in the action of the tragedy Achilles enters, bringing the news that the heroes have in their midst, unsuspected, an enemy in the person of the disguised beggar. Telephus is cross-examined, his identity is revealed, and he is threatened with death. In the *Acharnians* (566 ff.), the entrance of Lamachus parodies this scene, though not with very great faithfulness. The action of the original is much more exactly imitated in the corresponding scene in the *Thesmophoriazusae* (574–654). Cleisthenes represents the Achilles of the original and brings the

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Starkie on *Ach.* 514, which is the same.

<sup>35</sup> The scholiast is the authority for the parody of the *Telephus* in *Th.* 518–19 (= Eur., Frag. 711 N<sup>2</sup>); and *Ach.* 555 indicates that *Th.* 517 should be included as from the same tragedy (cf. Starkie on *Ach.* 555–56). The name of Euripides has, of course, been inserted.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Starkie on *Ach.* 558, 559, 562–63, 564–65.

<sup>37</sup> Eur., Frag. 706 N<sup>2</sup>: *οὗτοί εἰ πέλεκυν ἐν χεροῖν ἔχων | μιλήσοι τις εἰς τράχηλον ἐμβαλεῖν ἔμόν, | σιγήσομαι δίκαιά γ' ἀντεπεῖν ἔχων.*

<sup>38</sup> Cf. *Ach.* 317–18, 561–62, 659–62, with Eur., Frag. 918 N<sup>2</sup>, and Starkie's commentary on the passages in the *Acharnians*.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *Ach.* 558, 562–63, which express ideas quite similar to this passage. Starkie conjectures that the lines are possibly from the *Telephus*.

news of a disguised enemy present in the assembly of women: *καὶ νῦν ἀκούσας πρᾶγμα περὶ ὑμῶν μέγα | ὀλίγῳ τι πρότερον καὶ ἄγοράν λαλούμενον, | ἵκω φράσων τοῦτ' ἀγγελῶν δ' ὑμῖν, ἵνα | σκοπήσῃ καὶ τηρήσῃ καὶ μὴ προσπέσῃ | ὑμῖν ἀφράκτοις πρᾶγμα δευτὸν καὶ μέγα* (577–81).<sup>40</sup> The Chorus answers with a line of pronounced tragic tone: *πρὸς ποῖον ἔργον η̄ τίνος γνώμης χάρη;* (586).<sup>41</sup> Then the Chorus begins the search for the disguised enemy, approaches Mnesilochus, who exclaims in tragic fashion: *διοίχομαι* (609),<sup>42</sup> which derives from tragedy, if not from the *Telephus*. After some comic exchanges, one of the women announces her intention of cross-examining Mnesilochus: *ἄπειθ'· ἔγω γὰρ βασανώταντην καλῶς* (626). This is a line which is almost certainly modeled closely upon an original line in the *Telephus*, as similar lines in the *Acharnians* (110) and the *Knights* (1232) of Aristophanes and a fragment of Ennius' *Telephus*,<sup>43</sup> all of which seem to derive from the same original, strongly suggest.<sup>44</sup> In the original the line was probably spoken by Odysseus, who cross-examines Telephus there. In the following purely comic cross-examination, Mnesilochus' identity as a man is revealed. Although the language for the

<sup>40</sup> Starkie (*Acharnians*, Excursus VI, p. 250) apparently considered that some parts of these lines are direct parody of the *Telephus*. That is certainly possible, but the parody, I think, does not follow the language of the original very closely. In his commentary on *Th.* 577–81, Fritzsche cites some parallels from tragedy for some of the phrases in the passage.

<sup>41</sup> As Fritzsche (*ad loc.*) also points out. In 598, the very rare word *θεωρεῖν* is encountered, in paratragoedia, as Van Leeuwen (*ad loc.*) notes. Lack of evidence makes it impossible to do more than to question whether the word was suggested by the *Telephus*.

<sup>42</sup> The expression was not uncommon in Euripides; cf. also Van Leeuwen (*ad loc.*), who mentions its tragic nature.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. O. Ribbeck, *TRF*, p. 57, Frag. 8.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Starkie on *Ach.* 110 (which has practically the same form as *Th.* 626); Neil on *Knights* 1232 (the same in meaning but in different language), which is in close proximity to the definite parody of the *Telephus* in *Knights* 1240 (A. T. Murray, *On Parody and Paratragoedia in Aristophanes* [Berlin, 1891], p. 8).

most part seems not to be close to the tragic original, the development of the action and the purpose of the scene are in the closest agreement with the *Telephus*.

In the next scene of Euripides' tragedy, a notably pathetic and accordingly very famous scene, as the evidence of vase-paintings testifies,<sup>45</sup> Telephus seizes the infant Orestes as a hostage, takes refuge at the altar, and threatens to slay the infant. He urges that he be cured by the spear of Achilles, in accordance with the oracle that he had received at Delphi, but is bitterly opposed by Achilles, who calls for his death. At length, Achilles is persuaded, and Telephus is cured. The equivalent to this scene in the *Acharnians* is that scene (325–40) in which Dicaeopolis seizes as hostage the "coal-basket" in his arguments with the Acharnians and threatens to slay it, in order to secure a hearing, the scene thus being out of place with reference to the order of scenes<sup>46</sup> in the original but otherwise preserving the motif of the action. The original scene is parodied in the *Thesmophoriazusae* (689–764) much more elaborately, contains much verbal parody or paratragoedia, and is very faithful to the action of the *Telephus*. As the Chorus concludes, Mnesilochus is discovered to have seized a woman's baby. Taking refuge at the altar, he threatens, if they will not release him,

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Séchan, *op. cit.*, pp. 509 ff. The evidence of vase-painting shows that the *Telephus* was especially well known. Aeschylus in his dramatization of the Telephus legend was the first (cf. schol. on *Ar. Ach.* 332) to introduce into the story the seizure of the infant Orestes, but without threat of violence. Euripides first exhibited Telephus as threatening the infant's life. This was perhaps suggested by the similar act of Themistocles as a suppliant at the court of Admetus, as recorded by Thucydides (i. 136–37) (cf. C. Robert, *Bild und Lied* [Berlin, 1881], pp. 146 ff. and Pickard-Cambridge, *op. cit.*, p. 81).

<sup>46</sup> The parody of the scene in the *Thesmophoriazusae* follows the original order of scenes and the details of the action very much more closely than does the *Acharnians*. Here, as elsewhere, there is evidence that Aristophanes is freshly parodying the tragedy, not following his earlier parody in the *Acharnians*.

ἀλλ' ἐνθάδ', ἐπὶ τῶν μηρίων | πληγέν μαχαίρᾳ  
 τῆς φονίας φλέβας | καθαιματώσει βωμόν  
 (693–95). The language and style of these verses are so highly tragic that they would seem to be thoroughly appropriate to the original scene of the tragedy,<sup>47</sup> and they have been conjectured to have been taken directly from it. In the woman's answer to the threat, ὡ τάλαιν' ἔγω (695) is clearly tragic, and οὐκ ἀρήξετ'; οὐ πολλὴν βοήν στήσεσθε καὶ τροπάον (696–97) has with great probability been surmised, because of its military nature and tragic force, to be parodied from the *Telephus*.<sup>48</sup> Certainly, the idea contained in the line would fit the context of the situation in the tragedy after the seizure of the infant Orestes. Equally suitable to the context is Mnesilochus' retort, in which he threatens to destroy τὴν ἄγαν αἰθαδίαν (704) of the women, using a tragic expression. The lines of the Chorus addressed to Mnesilochus: τίς ἀν σοι, τίς ἀν ξύμμαχος ἐκ θῶν | ἀθανάτων ἔλθοι ξὺν ἀδίκοις ἔργοις; (715–16) are both tragic<sup>49</sup> and Euripidean in composition, and one can readily perceive how fitting the lines would be in the original context. The remainder of this

episode is treated comically, without apparent influence on the language from the *Telephus*.<sup>50</sup> The denouement is naturally comic and peculiar to the plot of the *Thesmophoriazusae*, not following in this particular the original scene, since the "baby" is sacrificed. With the exception of the last point, however, the action of the comedy here reproduces the action of the original with complete fidelity. With this scene, Aristophanes drops the parody of the *Telephus* and turns to the other plays of Euripides, as already mentioned.

The parallelism in the action and the structure of the *Thesmophoriazusae* to the *Telephus* and to the parody of the *Telephus* in the *Acharnians*, which has been described in the foregoing analysis, seems sufficiently consistent to justify this conclusion: that the dramatic structure of the first half of the comedy was directly influenced by the structure of the *Telephus* of Euripides, the plot and the action and the order of the scenes being structurally very similar. And, though the evidence of verbal parody must remain inconclusive, except perhaps for a very few verses, it seems highly probable that the language of the comedy, through general imitation, inspiration, and suggestion, was also affected by Euripides' tragedy.

#### FURMAN UNIVERSITY

<sup>47</sup> Excluding, possibly, the first five words (cf. Van Leeuwen *ad loc.* on the tragic words). Nauk (TGF, p. 580) includes the lines as from the *Telephus*.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Bakhuizen, *op. cit.*, p. 121; and Van Leeuwen *ad loc.* and the tragic references cited there. Lines 699–701 are tragic in tone.

<sup>49</sup> On the tragic elements in these lines, cf. Van Leeuwen *ad loc.*

<sup>50</sup> With perhaps the exception of Th. 724–25 and 731–32, which seem to have a tragic force. Bakhuizen (*op. cit.*, p. 122) refers to these lines as possible parody.

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### NOTES ON READING AND PRAYING AUDIBLY

That the ancients were accustomed to read aloud, even when they had no auditors, is common knowledge. A familiar passage tells how surprised Augustine was when he chanced to find Ambrose reading silently.<sup>1</sup> He and his friends tried to explain this strange occurrence, but he finally concluded that Ambrose might have been trying to save his voice, which often became hoarse. Other passages on the reading habits of the ancients have been discussed by Professor G. L. Hendrickson in an enlightening article called "Ancient Reading" (*Classical Journal*, XXV [1929], 182-96).<sup>2</sup>

The finding of some interesting new examples of reading and praying aloud has tempted me to add a postscript to the literature on the subject. In order to give point to my fresh material I have repeated two or three items from previous articles, with due acknowledgment.

No one seems to have called attention to a passage in Livy (vi. 25. 9) that is significant in this connection. When Camillus, having good reason to be suspicious of the attitude of the Tusculans toward the Romans in 382/1 b.c., entered their city in order to investigate, he was reassured of their pacific intentions as he heard the buzzing voices of children learning their lessons ("... ludos litterarum strepero dissentium vocibus").

The oral method of learning seems to have been common also in the noisy Orient of antiquity,<sup>3</sup> and the practice is mentioned in a

<sup>1</sup> *Confessions* vi. 3.

<sup>2</sup> In n. 1 Professor Hendrickson gives the literature of the subject. The two most important references are: S. Sudhaus, "Lautes und leises Beten," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, IX (1906), 185-200; Josef Balogh, "Voices paginarum," *Philologus*, LXXXII (1926), 84-109, 202-40. Another article, by W. B. Sedgwick, "Reading and Writing in Classical Antiquity," *Contemporary Review*, CXXXV (1929), 90-94, is a popular digest of the material available on the subject.

<sup>3</sup> S. Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie* (Frankfurt am Main: J. Kauffmann Verlag, 1910), III, 227-29.

legend introduced into an ancient Jewish homily:

"No philosophers have arisen in the world like Balaam the son of Beor and Oenomaus of Gadara. All the heathen assembled to the latter and said to him, 'Tell us how we may successfully contend against the people of Israel.' He answered, 'Go to their Synagogues and Schools, and if you hear the clamour of children rehearsing their lessons, you cannot prevail against them. . . .'"<sup>4</sup>

In the United States, schools in which pupils studied aloud and recited in unison were popularly known as "blab schools," and there were still some in existence as recently as the turn of the century.<sup>5</sup> Carl Sandburg gives us a picture of a school such as Lincoln attended: ". . . The scholars learned their lessons by saying them to themselves out loud till it was time to recite; alphabets, multiplication tables, and the letters of spelled words were all in the air at once. It was a 'blab school'; so they called it."<sup>6</sup>

Children who are left to their own devices read and study aloud.<sup>7</sup> In *Land below the Wind*<sup>8</sup> (p. 168) Mrs. A. N. Keith thus describes the reading habits of a young Bornean boy: "Usit learned very quickly. Every night he sat on the table in the cook shed, reading aloud his lessons from the Malay reader."

It is not unusual for the practice of reading

<sup>4</sup> A. Cohen, *Everyman's Talmud* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1932), p. 183. The idea implicit in the quotation was that, as long as the people continued to give careful religious instruction to the children, the nation would retain its ancestral virtues.

<sup>5</sup> See the word "blab" in *A Dictionary of American English*, ed. W. A. Craigie and J. R. Hulbert, Vol. I (Chicago, 1938).

<sup>6</sup> Carl Sandburg, *Abraham Lincoln: The Prairie Years* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1926), I, 20.

<sup>7</sup> Teachers of reading still warn those who silently move their lips or whisper when reading that they are cutting down their reading speed just as if they were reading aloud.

<sup>8</sup> Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1940.

aloud to be continued throughout life. An article published in 1930 contains the following comment in regard to laborers engaged in getting out teak from Burmese forests:

They not only can read, but they do read, and often in the evening one can hear, down by the men's fire, the drone of some one reading to himself. They have not yet mastered the art of reading to themselves without speaking the words.<sup>9</sup>

Even in the libraries of antiquity, oral reading may have been customary if one may draw conclusions from a general description of them recorded by Optatus, bishop of Milevi, who lived late in the fourth century after Christ:

Bibliothecae refertae sunt libris; nihil deest ecclesiae; per loca singula divinum sonat ubique praeconusum; non silent ora lectorum; manus omnium codicibus plenae sunt; nihil deest populis doceri cupidientibus.<sup>10</sup>

In the Middle Ages also "men were wont to read aloud even when they read only for their own enjoyment."<sup>11</sup> A novelist's portrayal of a thirteenth-century group of Oxford students as reading aloud is undoubtedly true to life. Of the hero he says:

He had intended to settle down with St. Anselm's *Monologium* but the solar bedroom was filled with the sound of voices reading aloud. He wondered if he would dare say what was in his mind, that in France and all other really learned countries it was considered a lack of scholarship not to be able to read to yourself.<sup>12</sup>

There is evidence that the ancients wrote aloud, so to speak.<sup>13</sup> In a passage in the *Heroides* (xviii. 19-20) Ovid informs us that he spoke to himself while composing and that his right hand conversed with the paper:

talibus exiguo dictis mihi murmur verbis  
cetera cum charta dextra locuta mea est.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>9</sup> *Nat. Geog. Mag.*, LVIII (1930), 243.

<sup>10</sup> *De schismate Donatistarum adversus Parmenianum* vii. 1 (CSEL, XXVI, 165). For this reference I am indebted to Balogh, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

<sup>11</sup> G. G. Coulton, *Medieval Panorama* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1945), p. 226.

<sup>12</sup> Thomas B. Costain, *The Black Rose* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1945), pp. 6-7.

<sup>13</sup> See Balogh, *op. cit.*, pp. 212-20.

<sup>14</sup> "Speaking such words as these in lowest murmur, the rest I let my right hand say upon the sheet" (Loeb translation).

In this connection it is worth noting that Dean Swift silently moved his lips while writing, as he observes in his *Journal to Stella* (March 7, 1710-11): "Do you know what? when I am writing in our language I make up my mouth just as if I was speaking it. I caught myself at it just now."

Closely related to the practice of reading aloud was the habit of praying audibly, a form of invocation that does not seem to be due to a feeling that the gods cannot hear silent prayer.<sup>15</sup> The astonishment of Augustine on seeing Ambrose reading silently was not greater than that of the prophet Eli on beholding Hannah engaged in silent prayer (I Sam. 1:12-13):

And it came to pass, as she continued praying before the Lord, that Eli marked her mouth. Now Hannah, she spake in her heart; only her lips moved, but her voice was not heard: therefore Eli thought she had been drunken.<sup>16</sup>

Today such a sight would not seem strange, for we have all witnessed similar things. A newspaper magazine thus recounts the actions of a visitor to the Roosevelt shrine, "a woman bent with age and dressed in the simplest garb":

The superintendent watched her shuffle toward the tomb. He saw her stiffened knees in awkward genuflection let her down upon the path where half a million pilgrims now have trod. He saw the quivering lips, behind her craggy fingers, move in whispered prayer.<sup>17</sup>

There are numerous records of silent praying by Greeks and Romans,<sup>18</sup> but one author concludes that the custom of praying audibly continued through all classical antiquity.<sup>19</sup> The upright man would naturally pray openly, as Martial (i. 39. 5-6) indicates:

si quis erit recti custos, mirator honesti,  
et nihil arcano qui roget ore deos. . . .

<sup>15</sup> Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv. 26 (Migne, PG, VIII, 1379). Cf. Cicero *De div.* i. 57. 129.

<sup>16</sup> For this reference I am indebted to Sudhaus, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

<sup>17</sup> *New York Times Magazine*, April 13, 1947, p. 8. For an example of a Negro moving his lips in silent prayer see *Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXIX (February, 1947), 47.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Cicero, *op. cit.*, i. 57. 129; Seneca *De ben.* II. 1. 4.

<sup>19</sup> Sudhaus, *op. cit.*, p. 190: "Diese Sitte, mit lauter Stimme zu beten, geht das ganze Altertum hindurch."

Those who whispered their prayers ran the risk of being regarded as evildoers.<sup>20</sup> An illuminating passage on this aspect of my note may be found in Seneca (*Epist. mor.* 10. 5):

Nunc enim quanta dementia est hominum! Turpissima vota dis insusurrant; si quis admovet aurem, contiescent. Et quod scire hominem nolunt, deo narrant.

In the Babylonian Talmud "he who makes his voice heard during prayer is of the small of faith," but one who is unable "to direct his heart when whispering" is permitted to pray aloud if alone.<sup>21</sup>

The classical tradition of audible prayer still persists, and a striking example of it appears in an account of the heroic defense of Malta in World War II, when the islanders were driven to the shelter of caves far below the surface of the ground:

An air raid gets under way, the low murmur of voices fills the cave. The Maltese don't just move the lips when they pray; they let the words out softly, like cooing pigeons. It's a warming comforting sound by comparison with the terrifying noises of war from above.<sup>22</sup>

Here we find mentioned "the low murmur of voices." In antiquity prayers that were like incantations or that contained magical elements would naturally be uttered in low-pitched voices<sup>23</sup> that might almost be called "ritualistic."<sup>24</sup> The comparison with the cooing of doves is likewise meaningful to a classicist.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 199: "Nur die äusserste Not oder zufällige Zwangslage, Scham oder schlechtes Gewissen und Menschenfurcht kann den einzelnen Beter zu leisem Beten veranlassen."

<sup>21</sup> *Babylonian Talmud*, trans. Rev. A. Cohen (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1921), p. 159. The second quotation does seem to lend some support to a seemingly fanciful story: "An applicant for a driver's license in Grand Rapids, failing in his written examination, explained that he had just purchased a new set of teeth and 'couldn't read because he couldn't pronounce the words.'"

<sup>22</sup> Alex McCormack, "Five Floors under Hell," *American Magazine*, September, 1942, p. 86.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Ovid *Met.* xiv. 57-58: "... obscurum verborum ambage novorum | ter noviens carmen magico demurmurat ore"; Isa. 8:19: "seek . . . unto wizards that peep and that mutter."

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Persius ii. 6-7:

haud culvis promptum est murmurque humilisque susurros tollere de templis et aperto vivere voto.

For prayers uttered in a hushed voice see E. E. Burris, *Taboo, Magic, Spirits* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1931), pp. 184-86. Balogh (*op. cit.*, p. 213) notes, however, that the word *murmur* was also used to describe the reading voice.

Herodotus (ii. 57) thinks that the priestesses at Dodona were called *peleiades* because their voices sounded like those of birds (i.e., doves).<sup>25</sup>

In view of the classical attitude toward reading and praying aloud, one can more readily understand why two questions are raised in the Babylonian Talmud: (1) whether or not he who reads the Sh'ma<sup>c</sup> without making it audible or pronouncing the letters distinctly has complied with the requirements of the law and (2) whether or not meditation is the equivalent of speech.<sup>26</sup> Perhaps such sentences as "The fool hath said in his heart" (Ps. 14:1) and *τὴ γὰρ διανοίᾳ ἐπεν*<sup>27</sup> would indicate that speaking and thinking or meditating are not always regarded as markedly different. We address ourselves often enough to make "think out loud" a common idiom.

It may not be amiss to note that we apply to printed matter several words that, strictly speaking, are appropriate for oral communication only. We ask what the paper *says* about the weather or repeat what a dictionary *says* about a definition. Printed directions *tell* us how to use certain things. The naïve mind may even take such expressions literally. An interesting example of this attitude of mind may be found in the autobiography of John G. Paton, a missionary who served on the island of Aniwa in the New Hebrides over seventy-five years ago. When he was building a mission house he penciled a few words on a piece of wood and requested an old chief to carry it to Mrs. Paton. The chief stared at him incredulously and asked him what he was to get. The missionary replied: "The wood will tell her." The chief looked rather angry and retorted: "Who ever heard of wood speaking?" In recounting this incident Mr. Paton called it "the miracle of the speaking wood."<sup>28</sup>

Even a Roman column may speak (*loqui*):

quantam statuam faciet populus Romanus,  
quantam columnam quae res tuas gestas lo-  
quatur?<sup>29</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Philo Judaeus *De mutatione nominum* 43. 247.

<sup>26</sup> *Babylonian Talmud*, pp. 95 and 134-35.

<sup>27</sup> Philo Judaeus, *op. cit.*, 33. 178.

<sup>28</sup> James Paton, *The Story of John G. Paton, or Thirty Years among South Sea Cannibals* (New York, 1892), p. 296. When Mr. Paton printed a book containing short Scripture passages that he had translated into Aniwan, another old chief wanted "to hear it speak" (p. 345; see also pp. 346-47).

Similarly, we may hear what a book has to say. Long after the time of Herodotus, who wrote his history for oral presentation, Diodorus (i. 6. 1) informs his own readers that he does not wish to overlook any facts "worth hearing," although it seems obvious that he was writing for the eye rather than for the ear.

How much did the custom of writing for the ear contribute to the excellence of ancient literary masterpieces?<sup>20</sup> Perhaps an example of a failure to consider the reader may give a hint of the correct answer to this question. When Lucilius Junior, to whom the authorship of the *Aetna* has been ascribed, showed a dislike for the style of the *Civilia*, by Fabianus Papirius, his uncle Seneca explained to him that its author "composed moral instructions, not words," and that he had written for the mind, not for the ear.<sup>21</sup>

The practice of reading aloud is not without modern devotees. Charles Lamb says of Milton and Shakespeare:

<sup>20</sup> Ennius *Scipio*, Frag. 2 (V<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>21</sup> Reading aloud is sometimes practiced even today as a test of one's literary style. Cf. the words of Henry James, as quoted by Wm. L. Phelps, *The Advance of the English Novel* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1914), p. 325: "I have never in my life written a sentence that I did not intend to be read aloud, that I did not specifically intend to meet that test; you try and see." Henry James's test was the test to which Greek literary masters subjected their works without realizing that there was any other possibility.

<sup>22</sup> Seneca *Ep. mor.* 100. 2: "mores ille, non verba, compositum et animis scripsit ista, non auribus."

These two poets you cannot avoid reading aloud—to yourself, or (as it chances) to some single person listening. More than one, and it degenerates into an audience.<sup>22</sup>

There are, moreover, some of our contemporaries who believe that the change from audible to silent reading has not been an unqualified gain, as the following words, written by a professor of American literature, show:

. . . What we need is more adventurous discoverers of the classics, who will shout out loud [while reading]. It is said that when John Keats came across the phrase in Spenser's famous poem, "sea-shouldering whales," he yelled for sheer delight. Suppose he had been in a public library? I wish there were more rooms in our libraries into which people could go to express their unrestrained enthusiasms—rooms in which they could read out loud to their friends, and talk, and shout with joy, and break into guffaws. We need librarians to encourage them in this sort of misbehavior, and trustees who don't regard Talking Out Loud as a penal offense.<sup>23</sup>

EUGENE S. McCARTNEY

#### UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

<sup>22</sup> "Detached Thoughts on Books and Reading."

<sup>23</sup> H. M. Jones, "The Place of Books and Reading in Modern Society," *Bull. Amer. Libr. Assoc.*, XXVII, No. 13 (1933), 590. See also R. W. Chapman, "Reading Aloud," *The Portrait of a Scholar* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1930), pp. 40–47. Nathaniel Hawthorne read aloud Spenser's *Faerie Queen* and all of Scott's novels. See Julian Hawthorne, *Nathaniel Hawthorne and His Wife* (Boston, 1885), II, 9. Even such lengthy novels as *Anthony Adverse* and *Gone with the Wind* have been read aloud in many family circles

#### "FOREIGN JUDGES" IN CICERO *AD ATTICUM* vi. 1. 15

The words *peregrinis iudicibus* (*Ad Att.* vi. 1. 15), used by Cicero in a statement concerning his activities as governor of Cilicia, have caused trouble and do not seem to have been adequately explained. They must mean "foreign judges" in the sense of judges brought in from outside the community or state.<sup>1</sup> They may even be a translation of ξενοκρίται, a word which, though rare, clearly is a technical term.<sup>2</sup>

The expression is used by Cicero in that

<sup>1</sup> For a brief discussion, with bibliography, of foreign judges see Larsen, "Tituli Asiae Minoris, II, 508," *CP*, XXXVIII (1943), 177–90 and 246–55 at 249–53; for additional bibliography see Jeanne and Louis Robert, "Bulletin épigraphique," *REG*, LVII (1944), 175–241 at 231.

part of his letter which contains the famous statement that in his edict he has followed Scævola on several points, "in iis illud in quo sibi libertatem censem Graeci datam, ut Graeci inter se disceptent suis legibus." Then, after a brief summary of his edict, he continues:

Itaque euro et satis facio adhuc omnibus. Graeci vero exsultant quod peregrinis iudicibus utuntur. "Nugatoribus quidem," inquies. Quid refert? tamen se abrovouiar adeptos putant.

<sup>2</sup> The word occurs in the plural in *TAM*, II, 508, and in the singular in a Spartan inscription. See the discussion by Larsen, *op. cit.*, p. 253, n. 55. This is based on the treatment of the word in Liddell-Scott-Jones. The two examples were first brought together by L. Robert, *BCH*, LII (1928), 418 and n. 3.

Vestri enim credo gravis habent Turpionem  
sutorium et Vettium mancipem.

To take *peregrinis iudicibus* as a reference to foreign judges will not clear up all difficulties in the passage but will at least make it more intelligible than it has been. Winstedt (Loeb edition), to be sure, translates "foreign jurors," but that can hardly be said to make the meaning clear. Boot's note, "Graecis, non Romanis," and Tyrrell-Purser's, "= Gracis," do not make too much sense. The suggestion in the commentary of Tyrrell-Purser on *vestri* that, if the word refers to Athenians, "*peregrini*" would seem to mean 'foreigners' (to the Greeks), that is, 'Romans,'<sup>3</sup> is not much better. What is wrong is the supposition that, depending on the point of view, *peregrini* must mean either "Greek" or "Roman." However, from the point of view of any particular state, *peregrini* means "noncitizens." It is enough to note that the fundamental meaning of the adjective is "that comes from foreign parts" (Andrews, revised by Lewis and Short; cf. the fuller statement of Forcellini) and that the opposite of the noun is *civis* as in "neque civem neque peregrinum" (Cic. *ii in Verrem* iv. 77). This meaning admirably fits foreign judges, who were called in "from foreign parts" and were not citizens of the state in which they served. They were used extensively in Hellenistic times and continued to be used to some extent under the Roman Empire. We have evidence for Sparta, Alabanda, Mylasa, Stratoniceia, and the Lycian League.<sup>4</sup> If to these are added the names of the communities from which judges were brought, the list of cities for which there is direct evidence of continued experience with the institution becomes considerably longer. Among the cities from which judges were sent to Mylasa in Caria are Termessus Maior in Pisidia and Attaleia and Side in Pamphylia. Others are Lycian. These cities do not add any new district but help to make the evidence particularly strong for southwestern and southern Asia Minor. However, since the use of foreign judges belonged to that local administration within cities or federal states in which the Roman authorities intervened the least, it is not surprising that so little is heard of them in our literary sources.

<sup>3</sup> L. Robert, *BCH*, LII, 417 f.; cf. Larsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 252 f.

Let us now look somewhat more closely at Cicero's statement and see what his course of action involved. When he mentions the clause "ut Graeci inter se disceptent suis legibus," it is natural to believe that this meant also that suits between citizens of the same city were settled by local courts. This is made certain by a statement in a later letter, "omnes [civitates] suis legibus et iudiciis usae *aietrovouia* adeptae revixerunt" (*Ad Att.* vi. 2. 4). In so far as the cities handled their own judicial business, it undoubtedly was a matter of indifference to the governor whether they used local judges or brought in judges from the outside. Some of the cities may have felt that the use of foreign judges added dignity and gave a greater feeling of freedom. Cicero records their joy, but otherwise his further remarks on the matter do not help much. "'Nugatoribus quidem' inquires" obviously is derogatory; but the precise meaning of *nugatoribus* is uncertain. The "mere nobodies" of Tyrrell-Purser fits and derives support from Cicero's answer to the imaginary objection of Atticus. These judges at least carry as much weight as those employed by Atticus' fellowtownsmen at Buthrotum,<sup>5</sup> or whatever *vestri* refers to. Winstedt's translation, "You may say that the jurors are wasters," seems less satisfactory. Yet it is well to remember that foreign judges did involve a considerable expense, though we know little about how the expense was met. However, we do know that the Lycian honored in *TAM*, II, 508 made a donation to foreign judges and that in the second century after Christ a benefactor gave 200,000 denarii for the pay of a foreign court at Stratoniceia.<sup>6</sup> Thus a reference to the cost of foreign judges would be possible

<sup>4</sup> Taking *vestri* to mean "you and your friends in Epirus," as suggested by Tyrrell-Purser. The suggestion that the reference is to Epicureans or Athenians is less likely. "Epicureans" would make little sense. If the reference is to a lawsuit or lawsuits in which Atticus had found two individual judges objectionable, then any city with which he was so closely identified that its citizens could be called *vestri* would do; even Rome is a possibility, though unlikely. A smaller community is more likely than Athens. Since we are not certain to whom *vestri* refers and do not know whether the judges mentioned served as residents of the community or as foreign judges, we can draw no conclusion from the fact that the names suggest Roman citizens.

<sup>5</sup> *BCH*, XV (1891), 200, No. 142, and XXVIII (1904), 39, No. 23A.

but does not seem to be what Cicero has in mind. The comparison with Turpion and Vettius rather seems to involve a jibe at their insignificance. The jibe probably was justified. Once upon a time, as in the case of the Achaean League mentioned below, matters of considerable importance were occasionally intrusted to foreign judges. Now such cases would go before the Roman governor, and so only relatively petty matters were left for local jurisdiction and foreign judges. Under the circumstances, for municipal officials to call in foreign judges to their aid was a bit of a comedy. We can agree with Cicero that it matters little; the "Greeks" think that they have recovered autonomy—a playful remark revealing deep insight into provincial conditions and also, it seems, sympathy for the provincials.

If the interpretation just given is correct, the offhand reference to foreign judges and the appended comments on municipal government imply a rather detailed knowledge of Hellenistic institutions on the part of both Cicero and Atticus. It is hardly necessary to demonstrate that they possessed this knowledge. Atticus certainly had had enough experience in Greece for such knowledge to be taken for granted. As for Cicero, a man who combined as he did the study of Greek culture with legal training and experience can hardly have failed to possess the knowledge. He may have acquired it from one of the Scaevolas, who certainly must have been acquainted with Hellenistic law and legal procedure, or he may have picked it up when he went to Athens and Rhodes to study. As will be seen below, Roman statesmen seem to have exhibited an understanding of foreign judges on one occasion as early as 183 B.C. It is possible that thereafter the institution was known to all Roman students of law and administration. Cicero's experience in and with Sicily would stimulate his interest and add to his knowledge. Thus the use of foreign judges by Greeks in his province is an interesting detail of a kind which it would be natural for Cicero to mention in a letter to Atticus.

This is not the only passage in a classical author which has been misunderstood because the editors did not have the necessary knowledge concerning the use of foreign judges. In the present case no great harm was done. It

was just one more of the many passages in Cicero's letters in which an allusion has been completely or partly misunderstood. More serious is the damage that has been done to Polybius xxviii. 7. 9. In this passage there is a reference to an occasion when the Achaeans had voted to cancel excessive and illegal honors which had been bestowed upon Eumenes II of Pergamum. The task of deciding which particular honors fell into this category was left to a court. The judges were Rhodians, who, on account of their private grudges, canceled all honors. There may be difficulties here, but, to those who know the practice of employing foreign judges, this makes a very natural and plausible story. Nevertheless, Schweigaeuser questioned *'Ρόδιοι*; Hultsch removed the word from the text; Büttner-Wobst bracketed it. For further discussion the reader can be referred to Holleaux and Aymard.<sup>6</sup> There is, moreover, further evidence for foreign judges in connection with the Achaean League. In 183, the year in which Flamininus, Metellus, and Appius Claudius served as a senatorial committee to deal with the controversy between the Achaeans and the Spartans, the settlement contained the proviso that, while the Spartans in other respects were to be subject to Achaean jurisdiction, capital charges against them were to be brought before foreign courts (*ξενικὰ δικαστήρια*). The only evidence is found in Pausanias (vii. 9. 5), and his account is somewhat confused; but there is no reason to reject this detail.<sup>7</sup> For Roman statesmen at such an early date to understand Hellenistic institutions sufficiently to turn them so

<sup>6</sup> Maurice Holleaux, *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques*, ed. L. Robert, I (1938), 441–43; André Aymard, *Les Assemblées de la Confédération achéenne* (1938), p. 185, n. 3; cf. also Esther V. Hansen, *The Attalids of Pergamon* (Ithaca, 1947), pp. 102 f. and n. 104.

<sup>7</sup> It is confirmed by the later ruling of the Roman senate that the Spartans were subject to Achaean jurisdiction except for capital charges (Paus. vii. 12. 4). See particularly Wachsmuth, "Über eine Hauptquelle für die Geschichte des achäischen Bundes," *Leipziger Studien*, X (1887), 269–98 at 285 ff. The source discussed is that for the account in Paus. vii. 7. 5–16. 10.

The earliest recognition of the courts mentioned by Pausanias as "foreign courts," as far as I know, is by Wachsmuth, *op. cit.*, p. 236; cf. the commentary on vii. 9. 5 in the Hitzig-Blümner edition of Pausanias, II, Part II (1904), 790; Dittenberger, *SIG<sup>2</sup>*, II (1900), No. 510, n. 25; G. Colin, *Rome et la Grèce* (1905), p. 226.

adroitly against a Greek state may seem a little surprising. It undoubtedly was natural enough in itself to submit to foreign judges capital charges in cases in which such political issues were involved that local judges would be prejudiced. In a more calm atmosphere the Achaeans might well have adopted this policy of their own accord. To have it dictated to them was another matter and must have been particularly aggravating for the very reason that the measure was so inoffensive in itself.

To return to Cicero, he obviously did not impose foreign judges upon the cities in the province but allowed them to conduct certain trials according to their own laws and proce-

dure and merely notes with interest that they employed foreign judges. To be sure, whenever a Roman governor delegated a case to a *iudex*, he followed a procedure closely resembling that followed when foreign judges were used, the role of the governor somewhat resembling that of the local functionaries who transmitted cases to foreign judges. The possible relationship between the two sets of institutions cannot be discussed here, though the resemblance may have been close enough to interest Roman students of law and legal procedure. Thus a remark on the subject in a letter from Cicero to Atticus is most natural.

J. A. O. LARSEN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

### LUPUS OF FERRIÈRES AND HADOARD

In his valuable article on the Collectaneum of Hadoard, which was composed chiefly of excerpts from the philosophical works of Cicero, Schwenke<sup>1</sup> discussed the knowledge of Cicero in the ninth century, the supposed date of Hadoard. He expressed astonishment at the number of Cicero's works known to Hadoard—the seven philosophical texts contained in what is known as the "Leyden corpus"<sup>2</sup> and the *Tusculanae disputationes*, *De officiis*, *De amicitia*, *De senectute*, as well as his greatest rhetorical work, *De oratore*. This list includes all the philosophical works that have survived except *De finibus*, *De republica*, and *Academica posteriora*.

A comparison with Lupus of Ferrières was inevitable. Schwenke pointed out<sup>3</sup> that, of the twelve Ciceronian works excerpted by Hadoard, Lupus possessed only the *Tusculanae disputationes*, *De senectute*, *De oratore*, and, possibly, *De amicitia*—not a very impressive score. He inferred that Lupus did not have *De natura deorum* or *De divinatione*, since he did not cite either of them in the letter<sup>4</sup> in which he discussed comets and collected passages from ancient writers who had mentioned

them.<sup>5</sup> But this is the decisive item in striking a balance between Hadoard and Lupus, for, if Lupus possessed these two essays, he must have owned a copy of the Leyden corpus, since they were transmitted to the Middle Ages only in that collection of texts.

Manitius is very positive in expressing his views. He states flatly that Lupus did not have a copy of the philosophical corpus and that his knowledge of Cicero fell far short of Hadoard's.<sup>6</sup> But, in point of fact, Lupus did possess such a manuscript—it still survives, Vienna 189, the oldest copy of the corpus that has come down to us, in a mutilated form to be sure, but once complete, with the possible exception of the *Topica*, which is also lacking in the Collectaneum.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> On the basis of Schwenke's statement, Sandys (*History of Classical Scholarship*, I [Cambridge, 1903], 623) declared that Hadoard's knowledge of Cicero far exceeded that of all other writers of his day (repeated in subsequent editions [1906, 1921], p. 648).

<sup>2</sup> *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, I (1911), 481, 479.

<sup>3</sup> This collection is not mentioned in the letters of Lupus, nor is it quoted in them. I suspected that this codex was a Lupus manuscript upon observing in Chatelain's facsimile (Pl. XXXVIII) that when the ligature & stood in the middle of a word the corrector broke it up by placing little separating marks above and below—a rare practice which I had noticed in the Berne codex of Valerius Maximus, the first manuscript to be identified as once belonging to Lupus. My conjecture was confirmed upon examination of the manuscript in Vienna. It should have attracted

<sup>1</sup> "Des Presbyter Hadoardus Cicero-Excerpte," *Philologus*, Supplementband V (1889), 397 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *De natura deorum*, *De divinatione*, *Timaeus*, *De fato*, *Paradoxa*, *Lucullus*, *De legibus*.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 406.

<sup>4</sup> *MGH*, *Epistolae Karolini aevi*, Vol. IV, No. 20.

The remaining text of Hadoard to be considered is *De officiis*. Laistner asserts<sup>8</sup> that Lupus knew this work; and Nelson states<sup>9</sup> that, while Lupus does not quote it, he does refer to it once,<sup>10</sup> but only to settle a point of grammar. However, an examination of the passage in the letters of Lupus fails to confirm Nelson's statement. Lupus is here discussing the verb *locupletō*; he says he can show that this verb is active in Cicero. Incidentally, he remarks that the penult is long and adds, parenthetically, by way of contrast, that in the verb *roboro* the penult is short.<sup>11</sup>

Now Baluze, in the margin of his edition of the letters of Lupus,<sup>12</sup> opposite this passage, gives two references to Cicero where *locupletō* occurs, viz., "Cic. in lib. de Orat. et lib. 1 Off.," but this does not prove that Lupus got the word from either of these works. He did own a manuscript of *De oratore*, copied in his own hand, now in the British Museum;<sup>13</sup> but this codex does not contain *locupletō*—there is a lacuna in the manuscript at this point (i. 234). That this lacuna did not originate in Lupus' copy but existed in his exemplar is shown by the fact that he left a gap on fol. 24v of more than a column and a half and wrote in the lower margin "hic deest unus quaternio."

In the first modern edition of the letters<sup>14</sup> a footnote on the *locupletō* passages of *Ep. 34* implies that Lupus might have had a copy of

my attention long before, because its format resembled that of a number of Lupus manuscripts; but who would have expected to find a codex of Lupus in Vienna?

<sup>8</sup> *Thought and Letters in Western Europe* (New York, 1931), p. 208.

<sup>9</sup> *Essays and Studies in English and Comparative Literature* (Ann Arbor, 1933), p. 80.

<sup>10</sup> *Ep. 24.*

<sup>11</sup> "'Locupletō' autem, quod paenultima producta nequaquam dubito proferendum (sicut quoniam 'robor, roboris' corripitur, 'roboro' eadem paenultima corupta proununtiatur), activam esse in Cicerone possumus confirmare."

<sup>12</sup> *Beati Servati Lupi presbyteri... opera*, ed. Stephanus Baluzius (Parisii, 1664), p. 70.

<sup>13</sup> See C. H. Beeson, *Lupus of Ferrières as Scribe and Text Critic: A Study of His Autograph Copy of Cicero's De oratore, With a Facsimile of the Manuscript* (Cambridge, Mass., 1930).

<sup>14</sup> *Lettres de Servat Loup*, ed. G. Desdevives du Dezert (Paris, 1888).

Cicero's *Orator*: "Cic. Orat. 13, § 42 et de Off. Lib. I, 31, § 112." The editor is here guilty of a twofold error. He misread the "de Orat." of Baluze's note as *Orat.* (i.e., *Orator*, a text which Lupus almost certainly never possessed), and he supplied references, which Baluze omitted, for *Orator* and *De officiis*. Upon examination, however, it develops that the passages to which the reader is referred deal not with *locupletō* (which does not occur in the *Orator*) but with *roboro*, which Lupus mentions, as has been said above, only parenthetically (see citation, n. 11). *Locupletō* is found twice each in *De officiis* and *De finibus*, but there is no evidence that Lupus ever owned copies of these works. It occurs also in Cicero's *De inventione*, and it was probably here that Lupus found the word. That he had a manuscript of this text we know from his first letter, addressed to Einhard, written at Fulda between the years 829 and 836.<sup>15</sup> *Epistula 34*, in which *locupletō* was discussed, was written in 837, the year after Lupus' return to Ferrières from Fulda. Another text containing *locupletō* is Cicero's *Verrines*. That Lupus possessed a codex of these orations we may infer from a letter<sup>16</sup> written possibly as early as 838–39, the date favored by Dümmler (other dates suggested are 836 and 856–57). By a curious coincidence our best manuscript of Books iv and v of the *Verrines* now forms Part I of Paris 7774A, of which Part II is the codex of Lupus, Cicero's *De inventione*, just mentioned. Both parts were written at Tours, but Part I shows no sign of Lupus' activity. Since fol. 80v bears the quaternion signature XXXV, i.e., since some two hundred folios have been lost, it is assumed that Part I originally contained all of the *Verrines*.

Lupus, therefore, had all Hadoard's Cicero texts except probably *De officiis* and, possibly, *De amicitia*. Further, he had others which Hadoard lacked, viz., *De inventione*, the Verrine orations, a collection of letters, and the *Araea*, which tips the scale in favor of Lupus.

CHARLES H. BEESON

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

<sup>15</sup> This codex I found in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris in 1910; it bears the signature 7774A.

<sup>16</sup> No. 104.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Apulée: Les Métamorphoses.* Edited by D. S. ROBERTSON and translated by PAUL VALLETTE. ("Collection des universités de France," publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé.) Paris: "Les Belles Lettres," 1940-45. Vol. I, xxxvii+85 (text) +85 (trans.); Vol. II, 101+101; Vol. III, 168+168.

This admirable edition of the *Metamorphoses* has been produced in the fulness of time by the patient, painstaking labors of two veteran Apuleian scholars, who have worked under adverse conditions but with never failing devotion to the highest ideals of critical scholarship and to the best standards of literary taste. It will be warmly welcomed by scholars and laymen alike, since it represents a notable advance on all three fronts: text, introduction, and translation.

To our understanding of the text tradition of the *Metamorphoses*, as represented by some forty manuscripts, two definite and useful contributions have been made in modern times: one, the more fundamental, by H. Keil in 1849, the other by Robertson in 1924. Keil demonstrated, on the basis of incomplete evidence but to the satisfaction of all subsequent editors, that F (Laur. 68, 2, saec. XI), the oldest of our manuscripts, was the source, direct or indirect, of all the others then known. This conclusion was based on evidence furnished by the presence of a large rent in folio 160 (see facsimile in Helm's Teubner text of the *Florida*), where a part of the text in viii. 7, 8, 9 has been lost. F must have suffered this damage at some time before  $\phi$ , our next oldest manuscript (Laur. 29, 2), was copied from it in the late twelfth or early thirteenth century; for the original scribe of  $\phi$  left blank spaces for the text missing in F. From this fact and from the fact that many of the later manuscripts show similar lacunae or disturbances in this passage, Keil concluded that all the manuscripts were derived from F after it had been damaged. But this precise form of Keil's theo-

ry failed to account adequately for the remarkably genuine-looking supplements which were copied into  $\phi$ 's lacunae in the fourteenth century and which, largely in the same form, appear in many other manuscripts where there is no sign of a lacuna or other textual disturbance. Keil supposed that these supplements in  $\phi$  were nothing more than conjectures made by scribes in the fourteenth century and that their presence in other manuscripts was due to the influence of the interpolated  $\phi$ . This view was still maintained by Helm in 1907, although Van der Vliet in 1897 had already announced the thesis, which was later to be proved and put into use by Robertson, that  $\phi$ 's supplements are taken from a class of manuscripts which is independent of F and descended from a lost copy of F made before the latter was mutilated. By careful physical measurements Robertson found (see *Class. Quart.*, XVIII [1924], 27-42, 85-99) that the supplements in question fit into the lacunae caused by the mutilation of F with such exactitude that they must have been there before the folio was damaged. A few years later Giarratano measured the lacunae and arrived at the same conclusion. The importance of this discovery is twofold; we now know that the supplements in  $\phi$  in Book viii are genuine readings of F and that in that group of manuscripts from which these supplements are derived (Class I) we have new and important witnesses to the original readings of F throughout the *Metamorphoses*, readings which have often been obscured or partially lost by erasures, alterations, or fading of the ink in F itself. In his edition of 1929 Giarratano made good use of cod. A (Ambros. N. 180), which is the most important manuscript of Class I; but, besides A, three other witnesses to the archetype of this group, one of them unknown before, are used by Robertson, who, in collaboration with H. E. Butler, has explored all the later manuscripts for the first time and divided them into four classes according to their sources (Introd.,

p. xlvi). Only Class I is valuable for the tradition—as being a witness, independent of *F*, to the original text of *F*. There are many places in Robertson's critical apparatus where this testimony is of first-rate importance; e.g., i. 3, *si qui*; ii. 30, *perlucida et*; vii. 23, *quidam*; viii. 7, *diesque totos* and *sed*; viii. 9, *inquieta quieti*; x. 19, *contentus*. No tradition independent of *F* has been found, although it was in the hope of discovering such a tradition that Robertson began his studies of the text as far back as 1910.

Owing to numerous erasures and alterations by the first as well as by later hands, the original readings of *F* are often hard to determine. Much, therefore, depends upon an accurate report concerning the testimony of this one manuscript, and no editor has performed this task so completely and with such painstaking accuracy throughout as has Robertson. The precision with which he describes the condition of *F*'s text at all dubious points and exactly what changes have been made in it is astonishing; see, for example, the notes on i. 20; i. 23, *Hecales*; ii. 1, *ambirent*; ii. 2, *est Lucius*; ii. 17 and 18, *defigati* and *cenuiae*; ii. 30, *cognorit*; iii. 2, *renitentem*; iii. 12, *scripsit*; vi. 7, *Iovis*; etc. In all this there is much new information not to be found in Helm or Giarratano, in spite of the fact that those two editors had collated *F* with considerable care. Since, however, Giarratano's reports in his edition of 1929 were made after Robertson had finished his repeated examinations of *F*, it happens here and there that what he says about an erasure, an alteration, or a reading of the manuscript is something that Robertson had failed to note; in such cases, usually quite insignificant in themselves, the latter is careful to inform us of his own oversight and to quote the testimony of others; cf. vi. 17, *iam*; ix. 18, note 3; x. 24, note 2; xi. 14: "facto\* (eras. esse s. affirm. Giarratano, ego nihil notavi) *F*." In the passage just cited the reading *facto\** would be inconceivable, and no one could doubt that the original *s* came from the following word *sacerdos*. This conscientious attention to trifles is no trifle in itself but a guaranty that everything possible has been done to give the reader a complete account of the one document upon

which the tradition of the *Metamorphoses* rests. Nevertheless, the critical notes, being condensed and restricted to essential matters, are relatively brief and probably no longer than those of Helm or Giarratano.

In dealing with the many passages in which the manuscript tradition is corrupt, or seems to be, the editor shows himself cautious and conservative in principle and very attentive to considerations of Apuleian usage and paleographical probability. At the same time he displays much ingenuity in the making of new emendations. The following, in my opinion, are among the best and most convincing: ii. 13, [attonitus] *et . . .* <attonitus> *et*; ii. 30, cognorit vel o>minarit; iii. 18, <*tu*> *fortius*; iv. 2, in <*odori*> modum floris [inodori]; iv. 8, ac iam cetera semiferis Lapithis [tebeinib:] Centaurisque <semihominibus> similic, whereon he compares Ovid *Met.* xii. 536; v. 5, <ut praesent>ius nihil; v. 20, sulcatum trahens gressum; vi. 32, aestuabit>; viii. 1, fuit; ix. 23, amborum ominata; x. 19 *Studentes*; x. 23, publica<ns pudicitia>m; xi. 5, *Actaeam*. The other emendations, many of which involve the supplying of a word or two that may have dropped out, all seem reasonable if not always necessary, and there are only a few passages where this reviewer would disagree with the editor's choice of readings. One of these is in i. 5, where Robertson follows Castiglione in reading "ut prius noritis cuiatis sim, qui sim: <Aristomenes sum>, Aegiensis." This, I think, is too elaborate for the occasion; the proper name is unnecessary, if not positively unlikely in this place; *qui sim*, as Beyte suggested, is probably a gloss on *cuiatis sim*; and *cuiatis sim: Aegiensis* in this context makes very good sense. The man's name is less important than his nationality. In answer to the question *Quis ille?* in the Preface, Apuleius begins by telling us the nationality of *Lucius*, but his name is not given until much later (i. 24). In ii. 30, I do not understand why the editor, who is bold enough in other places, where he has something brilliant to offer, is unwilling here to make use of commonplace, but necessary, medicine for *sed tantum*; this reading is very troublesome in spite of Armini's λεπτολογία, and any one of five emendations already pro-

posed would make the passage read much better: *et tantum, sed tamen, sed tum, sed tantum <non>, sed tanto.* In x. 14 *optimas* is retained from F in place of Helm's *optimas*, although with some hesitation; here it should be noted, since Helm, Giarratano, and Robertson are all silent on the point, that this word stands in place of *καλλίστας* in the Greek original (*Asinus* 46); hence *optimas* is probably right. In defense of the reading *iussis tuis*, which is rightly retained in iii. 12, Robertson observes that Lucius seems to be dictating to Byrrhena's servant a reply addressed to the lady herself. That is possible, in any event, and plausible in the realm of abstract speculation, but very unlikely, to my mind, in view of the author's many self-contradictions and small oversights. These oversights, though seldom troublesome to the reader, are nevertheless unmistakable for what they are, and an editor who undertook to defend the author in each case, however great his ingenuity, would have an impossible job on his hands.

The critical apparatus is full of valuable notes, aptly chosen and briefly expressed, relating to matters of Apuleian or late Latin usage, together with significant parallels from other authors in support of this or that reading, and observations on the meaning of the text. No two critics could possibly agree in their choice of *all* the variant readings for any text of this nature; but, after plodding carefully through every page of the text and critical notes, I find very few places where I am inclined to disagree with what the editor has chosen. The text is printed with extreme accuracy. Except for the spacing of *in flexum* on page 29 and of *decanta tis* on page 75 of Volume I, I can find no misprints. For the reasons stated above, this text edition of the *Metamorphoses* is definitive in the fullest sense of the word and should long remain standard.

Valette's translation, in so far as I have read it and can judge, is remarkably fluent, idiomatic, and lively and, unlike some others, never dodges the precise meaning of the Latin text: "Ecce Socraten contubernalem meum conspicio" becomes "Et qui aperçois-je? mon camarade Socrate." "Ain tandem? inquam. Potens illa et regina caupona quid mulieris

est?" becomes "En vérité? et quelle femme est-ce donc que cette aubergiste si puissante, cette reine de cabaret?" "Faxo eum sero, immo statim, immo vero iam nunc, ut . . . paeniteat" appears as "Patience—mais non: dans un instant, ou plutôt sur-le-champ, je veux qu'il se repente. . . ." "Ad haec ille subridens: At tu, inquit, non sanguine sed lotio perfusus es" is "Du sang? fit Socrate en souriant; c'est plutôt de pissat que tu as été arrosé"; in place of which an English translator, with a different kind of humor, gives us: "At this he smiled and said, 'As to that, you're quite mistaken.'" "Voti gaudeo": "Mes félicitations!" "Quam pulchre quamque festive, inquam, Photis mea, ollulum istam cum natibus intorques!": "Avec quel joli mouvement du derrière, et quel agrément, aimable Photis, tu fais tourner cette casserole!" "Quo gesto graviter adfecta": "Cruelle mésaventure!"

In iv. 11 it is related that the arm of Lachus was cut off through the joint *qua manus umerum subit*. That means through the elbow, as Vallette makes clear in his translation. F. D. Byrne, whose spirited translation (London, 1904) deserves to be better known than it is, also has it right; but Bétolaud, Butler, Gaselee, and Clouard have all stumbled here by failing to see that *umerus* is used in the anatomical sense of *humerus* and does not mean "shoulder." That is clear from the context.

In ii. 5 Byrrhena warns Lucius to beware of Pamphile's magic, which she uses continually in acquiring lovers or in avenging affronts: "serit blanditiias, invadit spiritum, amoris profundi pedicis aeternis alligat. Tunc minus morigeros et vilis fastidio in saxa et pecua et quodvis animal puncto reformat." Here Vallette, in essential agreement with all the translators above mentioned, renders *vilis fastidio* by "qui par leur dédains, encourent sa défaveur." This, I admit, is better than Hildebrand, who explains that *minus* goes with *vilis* as well as with *morigeros*; but it is, nevertheless, very improbable; the real meaning, I think, is something like "qui, à cause de son dégoût, lui sont devenus méprisables." Those who snub Pamphile are *minus morigeri* but certainly not *viles* (Hildebrand saw this, hence

his error); those of whom she has grown tired and for whom she has no further use are *riles fastidio* and ripe for the discard.

With the possible exception of Butler, Vallette is the only one of the six translators above mentioned who gives a correct translation of *vesperi* in iii. 16: "audivi vesperi, meis his, inquam, auribus audivi, quod non celerius sol caelo ruisset noctique ad exercendas in lecebras magiae maturius cessisset, ipsi soli nubilam caliginem . . . comminantem." Vallette rightly has *ce soir*; the others, all equally wrong, have *hier*, *hier à la tombée de la nuit*, *yesternight*, *yesterday evening*. The words quoted are spoken at bedtime (see iii. 13 *ad init.*), and *vesperi* here, as everywhere else in Apuleius, refers to the evening that has most recently passed—"this evening" if one speaks before the night is too far gone, or "last evening" or "yesterday evening" if one speaks in the past tense in the daytime, as in i. 18 and ii. 6. Is this too obvious? Not to the majority of translators and commentators, who seem to be bent on reading into Apuleius considerations of logic and consistency of which he himself at the moment shows no apprehension. *Vesperi* is due to ineptitude adherence to either the phraseology or the thought of the Greek original, where there was no Risus festival. In the next sentence, where he is obviously describing events that happened on the same day, Apuleius corrects himself by putting in *hesterna die*. The passage quoted above was obviously intended to describe the anxiety of Pamphile on the same afternoon on which Photis had given her the goat hairs (cf. *AJP*, XLVI, 260 f.); Pamphile is impatient and eager to use her magic on these hairs, because she supposes them to be those of the young Boeotian. *Vesperi*, "this evening," implies that there has been no Risus festival and that this apologetic explanation by Photis, which relates entirely to the animated goat skins and ignores the Risus conspiracy, was made immediately after Lucius' encounter with them—not twenty-four hours later, as Apuleius, after having interpolated the Risus festival, was obliged to represent it. If Pamphile had been cursing anything on *that* day, if would not have been the sun for lingering, since she presumably had

nothing more on which to use her nocturnal magic, but rather Photis for having given her the wrong hairs. So much of consequence may depend upon the translation of a single word. In iii. 25 *vesperi* again proves to be a stumbling block, and this time Vallette fails to improve on Béto laud and Clouard, who translate it incorrectly *hier au soir*. Butler has *last evening*, which probably means the same. Byrne and Gaselee, on the other hand, rightly translate *this evening*; the words are spoken "circa primam noctis vigiliam" (iii. 21), and the oversight to which Photis alludes was especially natural on this particular evening. It is only a few minutes later by the narrative (iii. 26) that Lucius, now an ass, is driven away from the hay which he had placed before his own horse *vesperi*—not "yesterday" evening (Béto laud, Vallette) but that very evening, *le soir même* (Clouard).

Despite Helm's warning in his note on i. 2, Vallette agrees with all the others mentioned above in translating "quoad lassitudinis incommodum alui solitum ac naturale praesidium eliqueret" as if it referred to evacuation or urination. I cannot doubt that Helm is right when he remarks: "eibus [i.e., 'alui solitum ac nat. praes.'] lassitudinem pellit; non de sordibus agitur." That the horse was eating as he went along is stated in the next sentence: "ac dum is ientaculum ambulatorium . . . pronus affectat." Since Vallette himself translates *lassitudinem . . . eliquerat* at least partially by "dissiper sa lassitude," he should have no objection to Helm's interpretation.

The usefulness of Vallette's translation for the general reader is increased by the presence of explanatory notes at the bottom of each page. These are brief and aptly chosen. They deal usually with topics of a special nature about which the reader must know something in order to understand and appreciate the text: various kinds of antiquities, public, private, legal, sacerdotal, and proverbial; matters relating to geography, history, mythology, religion, and magic; the relation of the Apuleian text to its Greek original; the nature of Apuleian literary art and composition; etc.

With reference to the dramatic climax of the Risus festival, when Lucius, the supposed

slayer, is forced by the magistrates to uncover with his own hands and to gaze upon the bodies of his victims, thereby justifying in a way his own condemnation,<sup>1</sup> it is interesting to note the Thessalian custom mentioned by Callimachus in Fragment 131, which I do not remember having seen cited in this connection: πάλαι δ' ἔτι Θεσσαλὸς ἀνὴρ ῥνστάζει φθιμένων ἄμφι τάφον φονέας.

It is undoubtedly true, as Vallette observes in commenting on the first part of Book vii (Introd., pp. xx–xxi), that the stratagem by which Charite's lover managed to overcome the robbers, though not mentioned in the *Asinus*, was told in the Greek *Metamorphoses*. But in that original version the young man must have been accepted by the robbers not in the capacity of their leader but as their servant and cook, a position left vacant by the recent suicide of the old woman. It is only as cook, not as leader, that his actions have any effect upon the course of events (cf. TAPA, LIV, 225, n. 26).

Vallette thinks that *Milesiae* (sing.) in iv. 32 refers to the entire *Metamorphoses*, but on this point, which is of some consequence, I feel bound to express a contrary view. I believe that it refers only to the tale of Cupid and Psyche; because this story is localized in the vicinity of Miletus, because, as an *anilis fabula* (iv. 27), told only to amuse and lying beyond the pale of the concept "history" (or science), which dominates practically all ancient narrative accepted as literature, it is "Milesian" in an eminent sense of that word; because Apuleius in any one place is more likely to be thinking of the matter immediately before him than of his book as a whole, which he describes in his Preface as *varias fabulas* in the Milesian (i.e., informal, entertaining, unpretentious) style, not as a *fabula Milesia*; and, finally, because, unlike Vallette (Introd., p. xxiii), I do not believe that the term *Milesia* (*sc. fabula*) would have been applied to a collection of stories such as the *Metamorphoses*, whether these stories were connected with each other, as in Apuleius, or not. It might be applied, more loosely, to the Luciad alone in view of its

<sup>1</sup> As Vallette observes (p. 67): "C'est la vue des victimes qui, portant la pathétique à son comble, entraînera la condamnation."

character, but that is less likely here, since Lucius is not a Milesian and Psyche is. We know that the term "Milesian," though primarily ethnological, implied something definite, though quite general, about the style and subject matter of a story; but we do not know that it implied anything about the formal structure of a book, and it is most unlikely, in view of the manner in which the ancients use such literary terms, that the words *Milesia*, *Milesiae*, or *Milesiaca* carried any technical implications of that kind. The statements of ancient authors concerning the lost *Mιλησιακά* of Aristides are such that they tell us nothing about its structure that can be regarded as sure: one man's guess that it was a collection of separate stories is as good as, but no more demonstrable than, another man's guess that it was a single story or a series of stories hung upon a unifying thread. Such terms as "tragedy," "comedy," "drama," "history," and "satire" were applied in antiquity to various kinds of forms and often implied nothing about mechanical structure or about prose and verse. And so it was, I think, with "Milesian." At least that should be assumed until we find some real evidence to the contrary. Without necessarily differing in kind, many stories told, however loosely, in the literary tradition of historiography, were designated by different geographical or ethnological names, according to the scene of the action or the nationality of the principal character or of the narrator. As there was no essential difference, according to Theon, between Aesopic, Phrygian, Lydian, Carian, Libyan, and Sybaritic fables, so probably the term "Milesian" did not imply anything more special than what *might* be found in an Ephesian tale, like that of the widow in Petronius, or in a tale associated with some other place, especially an Ionian city. The Ionians already had the reputation of being a worldly and pleasure-loving people when Aristides published a book of scandalous stories purporting, by their name, to be typical of Miletus. These stories must have created various impressions, not merely the impression that a Milesian tale was something naughty or concerned with sex. The book of Aristides was revolutionary and hardly less scandalous in

quite another sense: it elevated into writing, as if it were suitable for literature, a type of narrative which the ancients regarded as trivial and fit only for street-corner gossip, for old women, or for the professional huckster of *aureae fabulae* at a penny apiece. Such stories, being told purely for amusement and conspicuously lacking in any serious claim to historical, scientific, or philosophic meaning, or to belles-lettres as such, were, for that reason, regarded as illegitimate in the eyes of ancient critics, whose canons of literary taste and tradition were more severe and more restricted than those of today. From this point of view, any kind of story regarded as frivolous or inconsequential might be dubbed "Milesian," regardless of whether it dealt with an illicit love affair, a typical fairy-tale theme of unusual beauty, or the ugly machinations of witches; and that, I think, is why Apuleius represents both Thelyphron and Psyche as Milesians. When Aristomenes or Thelyphron tells for its own sake a fairly long story about the acts of nameless witches or about an unheard-of individual witch named Meroe, they are speaking *sermone Milesio*; but the classical and respectable way of dealing with the same subject matter was either to be silent about it or to refer to it very briefly, and then, preferably, under the mythological symbol of Lania, the Libyan queen beloved by Zeus and cursed by Hera, who is the abstract personification of all witches. And even then one was not very serious about it, as were Aristomenes and Thelyphron. The fact that the story of Cupid and Psyche is one of the most beautiful tales in all literature has no bearing on the parallel fact that such a pure fairy tale was regarded as an *anilis fabula* and as such unfit to be written down for its own sake by an educated man. The remarkable thing about this story, as Apuleius tells it, is the absence of any indication, other than the choice of names, of the symbolical meaning usually attached to it. It was for good reason, and not at all "inepte" (as Helm asserts), that Apuleius, apologetically, assigned this story to a tipsy old servant woman in a robber's cave playing nurse to a captive maiden, thereby giving us the only genuine fairy tale extant in Graeco-Roman

literature. It is "Milesian" by its uniquely unconventional and humble character, as well as by the fact that the scene of its action is laid near Miletus. Apollo gave the oracle in Latin *propter Milesiae conditorem*, for the sake of the composer of this Milesian tale, the story of Cupid and Psyche, with which the author and his reader have for some time been concerned.

Some account of Robertson's Introduction on the history and recension of the text (I, xxxviii-lxv) has already been given. The other part of the Introduction (pp. vi-xxxvii) is written by Vallette and deals with the sources and literary character of the *Metamorphoses*. This is the best and most reliable essay on the subject as a whole that I have yet seen. Vallette has a true sense for Apuleian values in thought, style, and methods of composition; and what he says about the sources of the *Metamorphoses*, the use made of them by Apuleius, and various aspects of the book itself is distinguished by good judgment and formulated in the light of a thorough acquaintance with the manifold data that have to be considered. He begins by quoting and translating the famous notice in Photius about the lost *Μεταμορφώσεις* of Lucius of Patrae, after which he gives a brief and lucid summary (pp. viii-ix) of the principal evidence indicating that the lost text was the common source of Apuleius and the author of the Lucianic *Asinus*. Next comes the question: Who was the author of the Greek *Metamorphoses*? Probably not Lucius of Patrae, who, as the principal character in the story, was most likely fictitious. Could it have been Apuleius? That was Cocchia's theory, based on the contention that the original story contained so much biographical material applicable only to Apuleius that no one else could have written it. Vallette does an excellent job of refuting this fantastic theory in detail (pp. xi-xv) and agrees with the present reviewer that the most probable author was Lucian (p. xv), of whose original *Μεταμορφώσεις* the *Asinus* is an epitome. He also agrees with me in seeing in the lost work not a collection of separate stories relating to changes, as has often been inferred from the title in Photius, but only the story of Lucius

and his transformation into an ass, however diversified that story may have been by small digressions and discussions no longer preserved in the epitome (pp. xvi–xviii). The contents of the remaining sections of Vallette's introduction are too varied to be briefly summarized; they deal with "Rapports d'Apulée à sa source," "Sermo Milesius" (see above), "Le Titre," "Composition," "Contradictions," "Variété et unité," "Le Conte de Psyché et l'histoire de Lucius" (provides a welcome antidote to fanciful theories concerning the symbolic value of this story for Apuleius and its mystical correspondences with the supposed meaning of the book as a whole), "Diversité d'inspiration" (with sensible remarks on the absence of a dominating philosophic purpose in the *Met.*), "Style."

In this interesting and well-written Introduction there is very little to which I would not heartily subscribe, and that little relates to minor points where Vallette seems to misapprehend the implications of what I myself have written. Since others have done likewise, I conclude that the fault is my own, and I take this occasion to explain my meaning a little further.

Vallette (p. xvii), like Morelli and others (cf. *TAPA*, LVII, 239, n. 3), is much intrigued by the apparent correspondence between *varias fabulas conseram* in Apuleius' Preface and certain phrases employed by Photius in describing the lost *Μεταμορφώσεις*. He thinks that this correspondence is significant of what was contained in the lost original, and of how it was composed, while I regard it as totally fortuitous and of no significance. One of the phrases in question is *λόγοι διάφοροι* in the title, which, as Vallette admits, is a stereotyped expression in Photius, applied to all kinds of volumes divided into more than one book, and therefore not significant in itself. But is not this combination (*λόγοι διάφοροι = varias fabulas* = an equivalent in the hypothetical preface of the Greek *Met.*) quite irresistible? I think not. Photius uses *λόγοι δ.* for one purpose, according to his habit; Apuleius uses "varias fabulas" for a different purpose, dictated by his own requirement, in referring to stories which are not *μεταμορφώσεων* (Photius

in title), and which everyone admits were in large part *added* by Apuleius to his Greek original. To my mind it seems more likely that Photius and Apuleius arrived independently at their similar, but very commonplace, expressions, *λ. δ.* and *v. f.*, under the impulse of what each had *need* to say, than that both were prompted by the phraseology of another writer, "Lucius," whose presumed preface, unlike his main story with all its principal episodes, is nowhere attested.

"Mais, à la dernière ligne, Photius parle du fatras de niaises mythologiques que Lucius a tissées les unes aux autres (*συνίφαινεν*) pour les publier." Like many similar words,<sup>2</sup> *συνύφαινεν* can be used as well of the episodes or details in a single story as of separate stories and is so used by Photius himself in Cod. 166. It is as noncommittal about the subject matter of a book as the English word "compose." How far the concepts "singular" and "plural" can be fused in this connection in ancient terminology is apparent from the title *ἀληθῆ διηγήματα* for Lucian's *True History*, and from the words "narrationibus l. anilibusque fabulis" applied by the old woman to her tale of Cupid and Psyche (*Met.* iv. 27).

But the main thing with which Vallette is concerned is the meaning of Photius' words at the end: *γραφῇ παρεδίδον ταῦτα καὶ συνίφαινεν*. He does not see how I can explain these words on the assumption that the passage in which they occur has no reference either to the subject matter of the lost work by "Lucius" or to its manner of composition. Now I admit that there is *some* reference to the subject matter; but to my mind this reference is so vague and so general as not to allow of the very exact and particular inferences that Vallette and others would draw from it. The words in question depend for their meaning not upon the narrow limits of the phraseology from *rās ἐξ ἀνθρώπων* to *φλήναφον*, which is *subordinate* to the main thought and to which *ταῦτα* below has no *special* reference, but upon the whole context from *Γέμει το συνίφαινεν*, which the editors have rightly punctuated as one sentence. Photius has just finished telling us

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *βαφωδεῖν*, *συνράπτειν*, *συγγράψειν*, *συντάγγειν*, *contexere*, *pertexere* in *Met.* i. 3, *componere*, *condere*.

that Lucian in the *Asinus* had thinned out the breadth of Lucius' λόγοι and joined the remainder ( $\tauὰ λοιπά$ ) into one λόγος; then follows the last sentence:

Γέμει δὲ ὁ ἑκατέρου λόγος πλασμάτων μὲν μυθικῶν, ἀρρητοτοιλας δὲ αἰσχρᾶς· πλὴν δὲ μὲν Λουκιανὸς σκώπτων καὶ διασύρων τὴν Ἑλληνικήν δεισιδαιμονίαν, ὡσπερ καν τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ τοῦτον συνέταττεν, δὲ δὲ Λούκιος σπουδάζων τε καὶ πιστὰς νομίζων τὰς ἔξ ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἄλλήλους μεταμορφώσεις τὰς τε ἔξ ἀλόγων εἰς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἀνάπαλιν καὶ τὸν ἄλλον τῶν παλαιῶν μύθων θύλον καὶ φλήραφον γραφῇ παρεδίδον ταῦτα καὶ συνέφαινεν.

In this sentence Photius is not trying to tell us what the *contents* of Lucius' book were, except in so far as to indicate, in the first clause—γέμει—*αἰσχρᾶς*, that they were much like those in Lucian's book (*Asinus*). Beyond that, the dominant idea is as follows: Although the two books are alike in content, yet it was in a spirit of ridicule that Lucian wrote this book of his, whereas, by contrast, it was in a serious vein and because he believed credible such things as  $\tauὰς$ —φλήραφον that Lucius committed this stuff (*ταῦτα*) to writing and composed it into a story. The subject matter is taken for granted and spoken of loosely, and  $\tauὰς$ —φλήρν., the object of *νομίζω*, is meant to describe the contents not so much of the book of Lucius as of his mind. Photius might well have described the objects of Lucius' belief in the same words after reading no more than what Lucius himself says in Apuleius or in the *Asinus*; although it is likely enough that there was more discussion of such phenomena in general in the *Μεταμορφώσεις* than has been preserved in either of the derivative versions, and it may have had more to do with Pythagorean doctrine. But I see no reference here either to various separate stories in the lost version or to the manner in which the book was composed. Vallette's translation, *qu'il mettait par écrit*, restricts *ταῦτα* arbitrarily to  $\tauὰς$ —φλήρν., which destroys the balance of the sentence; γραφῇ παρ. *ταῦτα* balances with  $\tauοῦτον συνέταττεν$ ; a truer translation would be *et mettait tout cela par écrit*, i.e., *πλάσματα μυθικά*, etc.

In the story of Thelyphron (cf. p. xxvii,

n. 2) I have no doubt that what Apuleius intended his readers to suppose was that the widow, after murdering her husband, hired a watcher to guard his body from harm, called in seven witnesses to testify to the condition of the corpse, and was prepared to cut off Thelyphron's ears and nose in the morning if these features should be found missing from her unloved husband's face, all for no other purpose than the incidental one of deceiving people (which she fails to do) about her guilt. But the only reason that we are logically compelled to make this queer assumption, and to regard the whole of the first episode as merely the details of a big bluff, is that Apuleius has seen fit to connect his second episode, which comes from another source and deals with a *guilty* widow, with this first episode by telescoping the two widows into one. It may be easy for the reader to shut his eyes to the purely mechanical character of this transition, as Apuleius intended him to do;<sup>3</sup> but the fact remains that the two stories are utterly incompatible by nature, and that they wouldn't be tied together, as here, in any spontaneous or original kind of narrative. It is obvious that the first episode was *originally* not the mere bluff of a guilty widow, as Apuleius expects us to assume, *after* we have read it on a different assumption, but a story in its own right about an innocent and loving widow; and if this widow had not been innocent, there would have been no story about the vigil.

Enough about the reviewer's views, which have been offered more in the spirit of celebrating a philological event than from any desire to disagree. I hope I have made it clear in the surveys given above why this new edition of the *Metamorphoses* represents an important contribution to Latin studies, for which all scholars must be grateful, and on the publication of which the Association Guillaume Budé, as well as the editors themselves, are to be warmly congratulated.

B. E. PERRY

*University of Illinois*

<sup>3</sup> The reader is not bothered at all in the first episode because, unlike the author, who holds a trick up his sleeve, he assumes throughout that the widow is sincere. In the second episode the reader is so impressed by the *περπίτερα*, and so charmed with having been fooled, that he doesn't want any logic.

*Alexander the Great.* By CHARLES ALEXANDER ROBINSON, JR. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1947. Pp. 252. \$3.75.

Professor Robinson's study of Alexander will be welcomed by all who are acquainted with his articles on various aspects of Alexander published in learned journals, but the circle of readers to which it is addressed is wider still. The publishers' notice tells us that it "is intended for the layman; it is an attempt to achieve what must be the final end of all scholarship, the summing up for the public of the essential meaning of specialized research." And the author himself in his Preface says something of his aim: "This is neither a history of Alexander nor a monograph. I am under no illusion of having drawn a picture of Alexander that is final, but I do hope that I have succeeded in suggesting, in general terms based on exact scholarship, a characterization which, partly new and partly a synthesis of what is already known, approximates to reality." The danger from which he has most to fear is apparent: it is the danger of trying to please two sorts of people and of succeeding in pleasing neither, of inviting the specialist to dislike his book on the ground that it is "popular" and the layman to set it aside because it is scholarly.

It seems to me that, on the whole, Professor Robinson has steered clear of both Scylla and Charybdis, like the experienced navigator that he is. Scholars who look for the faults which too often mar books written for nonspecialists on specialist topics—the superficial judgment, the facile generalization, the elementary errors in small matters or even in great—will not find those faults here. On the contrary, they will be prepared by the opening pages of the Preface (devoted to a discussion of the sources) for a writer very much at home with the manifold problems of the Alexander historian, and one whose views on these problems as they arise will command respect even where they do not enforce agreement; a writer, moreover, who is so far from being superficial that he can find something new and interesting to say about such minor characters in the story as Ada the Carian queen (p. 85) or the seer Aristander (pp. 150 and 153). Decidedly, the specialist has no cause to complain of this writer's work-

manship. Nor has he cause to complain if (for example) there is no discussion of the phrase  $\tauόθος λαμβάνει$  or its variants: the author would probably reply, and with justice, that there is nothing fresh to be said about the phrase now; that he has indicated sufficiently that he is aware of its existence by introducing its English equivalent occasionally into his own narrative; and that the common reader loses little or nothing, even if he never becomes aware of its existence at all. This is, in fact, a skilful reticence that suits the purpose of this book.

And what of the lay reader? It is seldom that he will find himself baffled by a difficulty that could have been avoided or removed—a rather cryptic reference to Demosthenes on page 61, or a sentence describing the assembly of the League of Corinth (p. 51) which might make even those who had thought they understood the assembly wonder whether they do understand after all; but, generally speaking, there is nothing here which need deter a serious-minded reader, whose interest is already aroused to the point of getting a book about Alexander into his hands, from reading this book through to the end. A criticism which does suggest itself—and it is perhaps a rather serious one—is that this Alexander tends to be a figure without a background. True, chapter i is an introduction of 36 pages designed to "introduce" the Greeks and the Macedonians, as well as the Macedonian royal house; but, in spite of all the unassailable generalizations about Greece in the fourth century, one cannot truthfully say that these people are brought to life. How did they live? Why did many of them (without ever having heard of Isocrates) welcome Macedonian intervention in Greece? Why did the opening-up of Asia by conquest attract them, very much as the opening-up of America by peaceful development attracted emigrants from Europe in the nineteenth century? These Greeks were not fifth-century Athenians, and we may not like them so well, but they were still very much alive. And if the Greeks do not live in this book, what chance have the Macedonians, that comparatively inarticulate race of soldiers of whom so little is known?

This lack of vividness or color in the background is reinforced by the intrusion, occasionally, not indeed of the author's own personality but of his own habit of thought, which recalls the reader's mind to the twentieth century A.D. at moments when it would be better employed in the fourth century B.C. For instance, on page 77: "The arrival at the Hellespont was full of drama and emotion, as each man momentarily buried all thought of his own uncertain future in contemplation of the European and Asiatic hordes that had surged back and forth across the narrow strait from time immemorial." I do not believe it for a moment, any more than I believe that British or American soldiers who crossed the English Channel to Normandy contemplated William the Conqueror or Henry V, Julius Caesar or the Black Prince. Alexander himself thought about Troy, certainly; but even he did not try to make his army think about it too. Or on page 108, referring to the fate of Tyre: "Nothing however could hide the fact that the Phoenician coast had been won by the commission of an enormous crime." The italics are mine, indicating that a modern way of thought here is being implanted in the minds of Alexander's contemporaries; for who will doubt that, at the time, the fate of Tyre and its inhabitants can have appeared a crime to nobody, except the Tyrians themselves and their friends?

Finally, the author, with what seems to me a failure of artistic judgment, deliberately renounces the opportunity, inherent in his theme, of describing a character, an enterprise, an idea, *as it developed*. He knows how it all ended, and he insists on telling us how it all ended, even before he has told us how it all began. It is not that he is unaware of development as a historical process, for on page 84 he indicates very skilfully a development in Alexander's attitude to the Corinthian League (see also pp. 136-37). But this does not prevent him on page 72, before he has begun to describe the crossing into Asia, from giving a short summary of the ordeals and achievements which were in store for the "Grand Army." It is as if in a performance of *Macbeth*, when the Witches first appear, a cine-

matograph operator were to throw upon the backcloth "shots" illustrating the plot about to be unfolded. As for Alexander himself, he stands revealed in the opening paragraph of the introduction (p. 19) with his qualities enumerated, even including those which call for the historian's most anxious decisions before he can arrive at his final judgment. That Professor Robinson has experienced the anxiety and weighed his material truly and well there is no doubt. But this eagerness to show the result robs the story of its natural power to captivate—"natural" because time is the medium in which history happens, and the most telling reconstruction must surely be that which allows the sequence of the events themselves, with the combinations and reactions which they set up, to make their own impact on a reader's mind, the effect increasing with an expanding theme. And no theme, perhaps, ever expanded more fully or more naturally than that of the Macedonian prince who became master of most of the civilized world, or the pupil of Aristotle who uttered the prayer of Opis.

Where this book fails, then, if it does fail (and in writing this I am very conscious of the fallibility of human judgment in reviewers), is not as a work of scholarship or as a purveyor of sound and interesting information to the general reader, but as a work of art. The author himself, I feel assured, will not complain that he has been judged by a high standard: it is the privilege of a high endeavor. Those who write of giants do not expect to be weighed in a pygmies' scale.

G. T. GRIFFITH

*Gonville and Caius College*

*Cambridge, England*

*The Italic Regions from Augustus to the Lombard Invasion.* By RUDI THOMSEN. (*Classica et mediaevalia*, "Dissertationes," Vol. IV.) Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1947. Pp. 332+8 maps. Kr. 30.

The thesis maintained by this scholarly doctoral dissertation of the University of Aarhus is that the eleven regions into which Augustus divided Italy exerted a direct influence on the administrative districts of the

peninsula throughout the period of the Roman Empire to the establishment of the Lombard duchies and indirectly continue their influence to the present time—in modern ecclesiastical and political divisions. The work is divided into two parts. Part I gives a full account of the origin of, the literary and epigraphic sources for, and the extent of, the Augustan regions. Part II treats the post-Augustan administrative districts of the second and third centuries, concluding with a survey of the extent of the Italic provinces as established by Diocletian and Constantine and of the changes they underwent to the middle of the sixth century.

In his survey of the Augustan regions, Dr. Thomsen refutes the prevailing theory that the alphabetic lists of municipalities given by Pliny in his regional description of Italy were derived from a work of Augustus, the *descriptio totius Italiae* (Pliny *Hist. nat.* iii. 46), which described the Emperor's division of Italy into eleven regions. Comparison of the frontiers of the regions and the town-lists of Pliny indicates that the alphabetic lists do not coincide with the division of Italy into regions. The town-lists of Pliny's account, therefore, have no relation to Augustus' introduction of the regional system. Instead, the lists which Pliny drew from Augustus were not those of the regions but were lists of towns of individual Italic tribes, drawn up for use in the *census*, and a specific work of Augustus dealing with the regional system as such never existed. Pliny tried to make the tribal lists fit into the framework of the Augustan regions and was not always successful in his attempts. As an alternative theory about the nature of the Augustan lists which Pliny used, Dr. Thomsen suggests that they were collected for the purpose of completing Agrippa's unfinished world map in the *porticus Vipsania*.

Chapter iii of Part I gives a detailed examination of the Augustan regions as they are presented in the ancient sources, above all, by Pliny in the *Naturalis historia*. The extent of the individual regions is determined, and their boundaries are fixed. In establishing the Italic regions, the author maintains, Augustus adhered as far as possible to the old tribal terri-

tories of Italy. But another factor—the natural geographical boundaries offered by the principal Italian rivers—was given equal consideration, with the result that tribal frontiers in some cases had to be disregarded. Here the author is indebted to the earlier work of such scholars as Mommsen, Beloch, Detlefsen, and particularly Afzelius; but in several points his conclusions differ from those of the earlier authorities and establish a picture of the tribal and regional geography of Italy which appears more in agreement with the natural geographical features of the peninsula. In connection with this chapter, the detailed map of the Italic regions (Pl. 8) is especially useful. Since, however, information of this character is, by nature, encyclopedic and since the permanent value of this study is likely to be its convenience as a work of reference, the usefulness of the work would have been considerably enhanced if the author had included an appendix listing in tabular form the eleven regions, the tribes included in each, and the municipalities belonging to each tribe.

The purpose of the regional division, Dr. Thomsen argues—against the views of Mommsen and Desjardins—was not merely to serve as a framework for the Italian *census* statistics but actually to set up an administrative system for the important new indirect tax, the *vicesima hereditatum*, established by Augustus in A.D. 6.

In Part II, tracing the history of the development of the regions in the Empire after Augustus, Dr. Thomsen shows that their influence on the administrative districts of Italy in the second and third centuries may be noted in the districts of the *iuridici* established by Marcus Aurelius. Here the agreement with regional frontiers could not be entirely maintained, since the boundary of the *urbica dioecesis* (which is identical with the hundred-mile area around Rome—despite Mommsen and the traditional view) cut across regional boundaries. The territory within the *urbica dioecesis* was under the jurisdiction of the *praefectus urbi*, while the *iuridici* exercised their authority outside the hundred-mile area. This line came to be the division between the criminal jurisdictions of the *praefectus urbi* and

the *praefecti praetorio*. But Dr. Thomsen is hardly right in his conjecture that it was Marcus Aurelius who fixed the boundary between the spheres of these two officials, since it has been shown by L. L. Howe<sup>1</sup> that the division had not been made at the time of Commodus.

Dr. Thomsen notes the existence of three "permanent" systems of *iuridicus* administration, extending from the reign of Marcus Aurelius to Italy's final provincialization. Three maps (Pls. 1-3) show the extent to which the boundaries of the Augustan regions influenced the formation of these administrative districts. There was no attempt at complete agreement with the Augustan regions—this was made impossible by the existence of the hundred-mile area of the *urbica dioecesis*—but the districts were based on them. The trend toward the final division of Italy into provinces was furthered by the work of the *iuridici*, since it was but a short step to transform their districts into the provinces of the system of Diocletian and to replace the *iuridici* themselves with the *correctores* as provincial governors.

Other parts of the administrative machinery of the imperial government in Italy—the districts of the *procuratores vicesimae hereditatum*, the domanial districts, the *cursus publicus*, the administrations of gladiators and army recruiting—are examined. Each of them shows traces of the influence of the original Augustan districts.

When the *iuridicus* districts were replaced by the Italic provinces, the influence of the Augustan regions in determining their boundaries was to a certain extent still felt. The maps of Plates 4-7 outline the changes in the frontiers of the provincial system between its establishment at the end of the third century and its final collapse at the Lombard invasion. A minor error in chronology may be corrected in this connection. The urban prefecture of Q. Aurelius Symmachus did not cover the period 384-86 (p. 215) but ended before January 12, 385.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Praetorian Prefect from Commodus to Diocletian (A.D. 180-305)* (Chicago, 1942), pp. 34, 96.

<sup>2</sup> O. Seeck, *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste* (Stuttgart, 1919), p. 87.

Part II of the dissertation is concluded by a chapter on the "Liber coloniarum" and the value of its gromatic information in determining the area of the Italic provinces and the extent of their agreement with the Augustan regions.

It is unfortunate that a work of such manifest scholarship as this dissertation should have been marred in translation from Danish into English. The translators have, in general, produced a text which is usually clear, but often not very readable. In some respects, however, their unfamiliarity with English usage has led them into pitfalls, with results which detract from the otherwise favorable impression made by the work. Particularly disconcerting to the reader accustomed to English is the frequent use of the present perfect tense, when the simple preterit seems to be needed to express the sense. Thus we are told (p. 37): "Besides Agrippa's map the preliminary works, Agrippa's Commentaries and the alphabetic town-lists drawn up by Augustus . . . have no doubt been published." The sense intended is that they were once published and were used by Pliny. Occasionally, the reader is surprised in the discussion of a closely argued point by a blunder such as the following: ". . . the greatest amount of caution is necessary if the extent of the region is to be deducted from Pliny" (p. 131). Or again: "Sehanz' theory . . . is incorrect as can be deducted from the passage quoted above" (p. 208). Similar slips indicating the unfamiliarity of the translators and the author with customary English usage are numerous, but it would be pointless to catalogue them. The proofreading should have been done more accurately. Nearly thirty misprints have been observed, but they usually do no serious damage to the text. The following may be worth noting: Page 220: *For* Theodosian *read* Theodosius. Page 236: *For* vorisc. Aurelian. 47. 2 *read* 48. 2 (in view of the reference in the dissertation [p. 220] to the problem of the date of the *Historia Augusta*, the wisdom of citing that work by the traditional authors may be questioned). Page 283: *For* assigned *read* assigned. P. 308: *For* easternmost *read* westernmost.

It would be unjust to overemphasize mistakes of this nature. They do not in any sense vitiate the careful scholarship, thorough documentation, and penetrating criticism of this dissertation; but they deserve to be mentioned, since they detract from the general impression made by the work and may serve as an object lesson of the dangers that an author should avoid when offering the results of his scholarship to the world in a language other than his own.

J. A. McGEEACHY, JR.

*Davidson College*

*Petronii Arbitri Cena Trimalchionis. Critical text and Commentary* by ENZO V. MARMORALE. ("Biblioteca di studi superiori: Filologia latina," Vol. I.) Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1947. Pp. xviii+178. Price not stated.

Language is form, not substance. Through this form there is (or may be) established correspondences, as to expression and content, between groups of relations or events (whether physical or mental), that are in themselves amorphous, and signs or symbols. Hence the analysis of language must always be morphological in principle. Such analysis not only yields the system and norm and usage of a language (i.e., as an institution, *la langue*) but also reveals the practice (i.e., of individual speakers, *la parole*). The description of a language probably requires, in all cases, a preliminary operation that proceeds from practice to usage. This is the point at which stylistics comes in, not the vague, impressionistic treatment of style with which those bores,<sup>1</sup> the literary critics, have made us unprofitably familiar but a rigorous *methodos* applied to the discovery and description of those features of selection (*legere, λέγειν*) in linguistic practice that constitute style. Both historically and methodologically we go from style to syntax. The last of the Nieman reports has a sentence: "What do you mean responsible" (*sic*, no note of interrogation). This is style in the process of becoming syntax: *tί ποτε λέγεις τούς βέλτιους* (Plato *Gorg.* 489 d). When *nequam*, "no how,"

<sup>1</sup> A "bore," as recently defined, is a man who has found the wrong audience.

becomes an indeclinable adjective, "worthless," a similar process is at work.

Evidently, the process is thrust before our noses more by some writers than by others, and Petronius is not one of the others. Editors find the (real or apparent) *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* in which he abounds the bane of their lives and foolishly feel themselves compelled either to explain freakish usage, which usually they are unable to do (if they could, it would not be freakish), or else, more imbecile still, to remove the offense by altering the text, and then they call this silly business "emendation." Often it goes undetected, since the reader, presented with an intelligible feature, is not likely to spend time and labor over one that is not. If we knew more about *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* as a phenomenon (theoretically, one would expect a large percentage to be polysyllabic), it might be possible to set up some criterion which would enable would-be "editors" to know at least when to stay their surgery.

Marmorale, fortified by his mother-tongue, is more sensitive to the true nature of this problem in Petronius than many of his predecessors. But no man can always be certain, unless in any given case he succeeds in finding the clue. Thus 58. 13 "*mufrius*: parola sconosciuta, usata solo qui e solo da Petronio. Se derivasse da *μύθος* (\**muthrius, mufrius*) come supponeva il Buecheler.... varrebbe 'ciarlon.' Ma fa meraviglia che nessuno ancora abbia pensato a *mufro, -onis*," etc. This is right, and I thought of it before 1933 (*PID*, II, 438; cf. 165, 455, III, 31, *ad fin.*), taking, *mufrius*, in view of Fr. *mouflon*, Sicel *momar*, Corsican and Hispanic *mufro* (Plin. viii. 199), mod. Sardinian *murvoni*, as probably Ligurian; *mufrius* will stand for an older \**mumrius* (less likely \**musrus*), lit. "sheep," hence "dolt."

So at 63. 3 *caccitus* is retained (*catamitus* [Buecheler], *alia alii*), though the "explanation" cf. *κακόρ* (not, *pace* Marmorale, *κακός*)· *ὁ μικρὸς δάκτυλος* Hesych., cuts no ice at all, for *κακόρ* is said to be Laconian for *κασκός*. But perhaps we are intended to pursue the matter in Hesychius for ourselves: *κασκαλίζεται· γαγγαλίζεται* (i.e., *γαργαλίζεται* "tickle"?") Hesych. I do not know why *caccitus* is marked with *i* long in W.-H. (not so *TLL*). If Mar-

morale had not gone wrong about *cicaro* (46.3), on which see now Bertoldi, *Études celtiques*, III (1937), 28 (*gigarus* can hardly be connected), he might have been led to *ciccatus*, which (I think) must be the solution: W. *cig*, "flesh," Corn. *chic*, "flesh," Bret. *chigota* ("faire des espègleries")—*ciccatus et omnium numerum* "a dainty piece, on all counts too." The gemination would be expected, though only *Cicaro*, *Cicaru* appears as the name of an East Gaulish potter, and gemination abounds among such names (*Satto*, *Mommo*). Temptation to emend Petronius (*CP*, XLII [1947], 182) is always strong; etymology does less mischief, and, having risked so much, I may as well go on and conjecture that we have here a hint of the mysterious English *chic*. Bertoldi did not shrink from bringing *gigolo* into the picture.

As for *unam* at 71. 11 (*urnam* edd.), note *humis* (i.e., *umis*, see *AJP*, LXIII [1942], 228), beside *umeo*, *umor*; but I shrink from taking a further step here, and those who do not accept *unam* (sc. *amphoram*) of the manuscript had better take Gronovius and all the rest, down to Buecheler (except Heinsius), and read *urnam*, though the symbolism would be Christian rather than pagan.

Now these are the three places which Marmorale has claimed as typical of his handling of the text, both critical and exegetical. They are fair samples; I have tested, word for word, sections 36–46, which happen to appear in Slotty's *Vulgärlateinisches Übungsbuch*—why they used to be set in local examinations for English schoolboys, I cannot guess; but it is clear that much of what was desperate in Petronius in 1910 (see the Preface to A. C. B. Brown's *Selection from the Latin Literature of the Early Empire* "to serve as a textbook for the Oxford Local Examinations") is still desperate in 1947 and likely always so to be, world without end. Marmorale's text is conservative, more even than Buecheler's (and Buecheler, like Hermann, "a German"), his comment is full, his knowledge of the *sermo cottidianus* adequate, his own suggestions sometimes convincing, sometimes not (like mine, in the margins of my Slotty), and there the matter must rest. He has made a careful

study of the "literature" (witness his bibliography, the items of which he uses and quotes, so that his list is not a mere compilation), of the textual problem, and (to appear in a forthcoming volume) of the problem of authorship and of the author's much disputed age (Marmorale rejects the Neronian setting). His edition gives a favorable impression, notwithstanding the confusion of superior numerals which do and do not (e.g., p. vi) refer to footnotes, or of cabalistic and frightening Nazi-looking references such as *Buecheler* (!). His attention to *la parole*, with which, in the sense of De Saussure, I began, is admirable; and I, for one, by preference shall hereafter take my *cena* with Trimalchio in the company of Sig. Marmorale (as well as of Petronius) until something handier appears.

Reviewers commonly list misprints in order, I suspect, to infer some evidence that they have read the book. This book is not free of them: what book is? But they are so infrequent and trifling (nowhere I think defeating), that I am not going to list them. Any Cerberus who must have his sop may take: page xviii (s.v. "Todd"), for *CR* 58 (1936) read 50—and this has led in its turn to the error *CR* 61 (1939), sc. 53; page xv, Sedgwick's edition appeared in 1925, not 1939.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

*Harvard University*

#### *The Historical Work of Ammianus Marcellinus.*

By E. A. THOMPSON. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1947. Pp. xi+145. \$2.50.

The author deals, first, with the life of Ammianus and with the vexed question of his sources in the main narrative of the *History*. He then discusses Ammianus' portraits of Gallus, Ursicinus, Julian, Theodosius the Elder, and Maximin and his interpretation of their characters. There follows a chapter on the last six books, in which the historian's treatment is less full or more compressed than in the rest of the work. Mr. Thompson concludes with a general appraisal of Ammianus' historical writing. Two short appendixes, dealing, respectively, with Zosimus' and Ammianus' ac-

counts of Julian's Persian expedition and with the dating of Maximin's prosecution of senatorial families, and an Index complete this notable little book.

The chapters on the sources and on Gallus, which have already appeared in print, are here re-published with minor corrections; the rest of the book is new. Mr. Thompson argues that Ammianus was a member of a curial family and rightly maintains that his military career was continuous until his retirement from the army after Julian's death. He demolishes—let us hope for good—the claims of Magnus of Carrhae as Ammianus' source for the Persian war and thereby deals a shrewd blow at that pernicious invention of German pseudo-scholarship, the *Einquellenprinzip*. His examination of Ammianus' attitude toward various prominent personages in the *History* leads to some interesting conclusions. He suggests that the historian was unduly severe on Gallus and too partial to Ursicinus. He lays stress on the difference between Ammianus' portrayal of Julian before and after he became Augustus. The adverse judgment passed on much of the emperor's policy was thus inspired partly by Julian's treatment of the *curiales* and partly by caution, since the historian was writing of a pagan under a Christian ruler. A similar caution inspired the account of Theodosius the Elder's career and the severe and hostile estimate of Maximin. Mr. Thompson agrees with those scholars who regard the last six books as in a sense an afterthought. Here, too, he suggests that certain omissions and suppressions were due to fear of the reigning emperor, Theodosius. It has only been possible to indicate a few of the topics discussed in this book. The author writes with great modesty and freely admits that his interpretation sometimes rests on a succession of hypotheses. But Mr. Thompson knows his author and the period well. In short, this is the most original piece of work on Ammianus' *History* that has appeared in a long while and must be taken seriously into account by future students of the historian.

In one respect Mr. Thompson is still held fast in the trammels of traditionalism, for he repeats with little variation the familiar and unfavorable judgment on Ammianus' Latinity

and style. Incidentally, this leads him to quite erroneous conclusions about the occurrence of Greek words in Ammianus. These are nearly always technical or quasi-technical terms. Celsus, who wrote admirable Latin, constantly introduced words from Greek medical terminology into his text, and there can be no doubt that the words listed by Mr. Thompson in note 1 on page 17 were derived from some medical writer. Similarly, Hyginus (*Astr.* i. 4) employs *horizon* and many other Greek astronomical terms. It is therefore mistaken to regard the use of such Greek words by Ammianus as proof that his knowledge of Latin was defective. The practice had a long history and in time was abused, for the introduction of Greek words here and there with some such qualifying phrase as *quod Graeci vocant* is frequent in early medieval Latin writers who were anxious to display a smattering of Greek for the edification of their readers. This reviewer may perhaps be forgiven for referring to his recent discussion of Ammianus' Latinity in *The Greater Roman Historians* (University of California Press, 1947), pages 143–48, for a fuller treatment of this subject.

When describing Ammianus' account of Gaul, Mr. Thompson seems to have overlooked the fact that the historian begins by naming his authority, Timagenes. Thus some parts of Ammianus' description, including that of the Gaulish termagant, of whom it may truly be said that the female of the species was more deadly than the male, are the result of booklearning, not of personal experience (cf. F. Jacoby, *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Vol. IIA, No. 88, with commentary in Vol. IIC). Mr. Thompson's arguments in favor of regarding Books xxvi–xxxii as an afterthought are not wholly convincing, mainly because he seems to read too much into the opening sentences of Book xxvi. The dangers and difficulties inherent in composing strictly contemporary history were already something of a commonplace long before Ammianus' time (cf., e.g., Tacitus *Ann.* iv. 33. 2 and especially the remarks of the younger Pliny [*Ep.* v. 8. 12]). It may also be significant that Livy, so far as one can judge from the epitomes, in Books exxxii–exlii concentrated mainly on military and foreign affairs and dealt but sketchily

with Augustus' internal reforms. As for Ammianus' expressed dislike of recording the trivia of court and official life, similar reluctance was expressed by Tacitus more than once (cf., e.g., *Ann.* xiii. 31).

Ammianus may on occasion have condoned the "agreeable custom of assassinating a guest at dinner" (p. 100); still, in fairness to the historian, Mr. Thompson might have pointed out that Ammianus, when recording the murder of the Armenian king by the *dux* Trajan (xxx. 1. 18–23), contrasts this treachery with the very different conduct of Fabricius Luscinus toward King Pyrrhus. And his further comment (*in usitatum facinus et pudendum*) shows that he, for one, did not accept the excuses made for the murder. The translations of two considerable passages from the *History* on pages 122–24 are excellent. But why in the former are the words *contra timidos celsior* omitted? Mr. Thompson, on the other hand, is right in retaining the reading of V, *munitus*. It is hard to see why Clark adopted in his text the emendation of Gelenius, *minutus*. At the beginning of the second passage the rendering "indifferent" for *remissior* is weak and destroys the contrast with the preceding *severus*. Valentinian was harsh to common soldiers, more easygoing or more indulgent to those that were highly placed.

Mr. Thompson is a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, an institution that has a long and distinguished history as a *fautrix* of classical studies. In this his first book he maintains the high standards of scholarship that one has learned to expect from its alumni, and one looks with pleasurable anticipation to future books from his pen.

M. L. W. LAISTNER

Cornell University

*Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar*, Heft I: *Dikaiarchos*. By FRITZ WEHRLI. Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co., 1944. Pp. 80. Paper, \$2.50. Heft II: *Aristoxenos*. By FRITZ WEHRLI. Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co., 1945. Pp. 88. Paper, \$3.00. American representative, Albert J. Phiebig, Suite 1209, 545 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.

These two slim volumes are the beginning of a project to publish the fragments of the Peripatetic school (Aristotle and Theophrastus excepted) from the fourth to the second century B.C. Each volume contains a collection of fragments, a bibliography, and a commentary. There is no general introduction, nor are there any indexes, lists of passages quoted, or tables correlating the numbers of the fragments in this edition with those found in earlier editions. Perhaps these elements will eventually be added.

The volume on Dicaearchus lists 115 genuine and 3 doubtful or spurious fragments. The total number of passages is somewhat greater, as some fragments are divided into *a*, *b*, *c*, etc. Wehrli lists over twenty passages that are not mentioned in Müller's edition (*FHG*, II, 225–68), and he publishes the text of many passages to which Müller makes only casual reference. On the other hand, Wehrli omits Müller's Fragment 68 (from *Ps.-Cicero Consol.*), and he does not print the text of the three geographical passages (*FHG*, II, 254–64 = *GGM*, I, 97–110), which he considers spurious (see commentary on Frag. 117).

The volume on Aristoxenus is uniform with that on Dicaearchus, except that the type is slightly different. Wehrli lists 139 fragments of Aristoxenus, about 20 of which are not mentioned in Müller (*FHG*, II, 269–92). As in the volume on Dicaearchus, the fragments are assigned as far as possible to the author's various works, with the result that a single passage may be listed under more than one number (e.g., Frag. 32 = 63). Cross-references to the fragments of Dicaearchus are sometimes made (e.g., Ar. 118 = Die. 8e); in such instances the text of the passage involved is not reprinted.

Wehrli's editions will no doubt be very useful, as they bring together material from widely scattered sources and provide in the commentaries a treatment of many problems, along with extensive bibliographical references. Yet they would be much more useful if they had been prepared with a little more attention to detail. A careful revision will be needed before they can be used with convenience and confidence.

One serious shortcoming is in the identification of the passages quoted. Inconsistencies

appear in: "Plutarch. Theseus 32" (Dic. 66), but "Plutarch. Theseus XXI" (Dic. 85); "Harpocratio" (Ar. 91), but "Harpocration" (Ar. 105). References to Plutarch's *Quaestiones convivales* sometimes include page numbers (Dic. 41, 46) and sometimes not (Ar. 74, 85). More serious are the inaccuracies in the *lemmata* of the fragments. Dic. 20 should read: "Epist. ad Atticum VI 2, 3"; Dic. 22 should read: "Schol. vetus Pindar. Olymp. VI 7 b"; in Dic. 35a read: "ib. 57." In Dic. 118 the word "Volumina" should be deleted. Wehrli seems to apply the words *Volumina Herculaneum* to the actual papyrus rolls rather than to the Naples edition of them. The same error appears in Ar. 22 (where Cröner's restoration is incompletely given); compare Ar. 94, where an accurate identification would be: "Vol. Herc. I, pap. 1497, col. XXIX." In Ar. 11b and 84 read "Stromateis" for "Stromata." In Ar. 120b the cross-reference to Dic. 8d is not adequate, as the text of the latter breaks off abruptly in the middle of the sentence dealing with Aristoxenus.

Errors in the Greek and Latin texts are far too numerous to mention. Most of them are small (e.g., Greek accents and breathings) and are easily corrected by the reader. More important are the following: Dic., page 16, line 35, insert "locum" before "excipit"; Dic., page 28, line 29, insert "id" before "quod"; Ar., page 11, lines 9 and 22, read *σις*' for *σις*' and *σισ'*. Ar., page 21, line 21, mark an omission after *ώνηθῆναι*. Ar., page 31, line 30, read *Λάστον* for *Λάσσον*. Ar., page 33, line 27, remove the brackets from [τοῖς]. Ar., page 37, line 9, read: "(sc. animam esse dixit)." Ar., page 39, line 2, insert *τινὰ* before *αὐτοῖς*.

As Wehrli undertakes to establish his own text of the passages he quotes, there is always a possibility that his departures from standard editions are intentional. In his critical notes he has identified a few readings as his own conjectures. Those which he has derived from a comparison of parallel texts (e.g., Ar., p. 18, note on l. 21; p. 20, note on l. 6; p. 40, note on l. 31; Dic., p. 31, note on l. 10; p. 33, note on l. 10) certainly deserve consideration. Rather more hazardous is his reading: "mihi credas,

lege te hac doceo," in Cic. *Ad Att.* ii. 2. 2 (Dic., p. 28, l. 23). In general, Wehrli's text is conservative.

The critical notes are very uneven, and in some instances Wehrli either does not know or has chosen to ignore the latest critical editions of the texts he quotes. In particular, he does not use De Falco's edition of *Theolog. arith.* (Ar. 12) or Van Krevelen's edition of Philodemus *De musica* (Ar. 73, 94; Dic. 93). He seldom mentions his sources, and there is no indication that he has consulted the manuscripts of any of the authors quoted. The critical notes are deficient in that they sometimes fail to mention emendations printed in the text and to give the correct source of emendations. For example, in Ar., page 30, lines 30-32, Weil-Reinach's transposition of the words *καὶ περὶ . . . κέχρηται* is accepted in the text but not mentioned in the notes. In Dic., page 15, notes on lines 12, 21, 26, 32, and 35, the sources of the emendations are not given. "Est" (Dic., p. 18, l. 18) is an emendation of Madvig; *δεδεμένος* (p. 19, l. 1) an emendation of Wyttensbach. In Ar., page 19, note on line 13, the *varia lectio* is given by Hense as *ἡδη τὰ γνωρίσματα*. On page 20, line 8, the reading *εἰδέναι* is attributed by Hense and Diels to Koenius. On page 29, line 11, the *varia lectio* "Euenus" for Aristoxenus should be given, since it is accepted by most editors. On page 32, lines 18 and 27, the sources of the supplements should be given; page 40, note on line 13, the supplement here assigned to Hicks already appears in Cobet and is assigned by Dies to Reiske.

This is by no means a complete list of errors. I have found many more, and surely I have not found all. In view of this fact I should recommend that Wehrli's editions be used with great caution.

PHILLIP DE LACY

*University of Chicago*

*Philologica*. By ALFRED ERNOUT. ("Études et commentaires.") Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1946. Pp. vi+232. Fr. 600.

A few scholars expressly forbid, both in life and in death, the collection of their occasional

papers; many gather them together in their own lifetimes; some are honored by posthumous *collectanea*. The sixteen items of Ernout's *Philologica* run from 1921 to 1946, six of them being later than 1939. All except the first, which is his inaugural lecture at the Collège de France (1945), have been published before (the missing reference for item 15 is *Rev. de philol.*, 3<sup>e</sup> Sér., XIX, No. 2 [1945], 93–115), and the substantial results of these have largely been gathered into Ernout and Meillet's *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Naturally, there are a few additions or changes—but not many. I think I had read all save the inaugural lecture, some more than once. Most I have on my shelves, though there are gaps between 1939 and 1945, for which this volume may be the only "fill" for some libraries, and one or two I had not previously read with the care they deserved. On page 157 *μεπαξ* has no need of an asterisk; page 200: *insert* does *before* not need; page 216: five lines from the bottom, something is missing after *entièrement*; page 226: in "celle de *seruus* est plus contestée," *for seruus read seruitus*. There are no other serious misprints, I think, beyond a few broken type.

I wonder how many Latinists read M. Ernout's papers in *BSL*, *MSL*, various *Mélanges* to which he has contributed, and the like. If, unlike me, they have missed them, let them buy this book at once. They will not regret it. Here is the finest flower of scholarship, its value enhanced, ten thousand times ten thousand, by an intimate knowledge—no not of Latin literature, though Ernout has it, but so have many others, all of them ignorant, but of the Latin language and of its history and of Indo-European, which the many others have not because they have been told that it is dull. It is not dull. These pages glow with illumination, that he who runs may read. Latin was taught in Conway's lecture room like this, and the reading of Ernout's book these long summer afternoons has taken me back in memory and spirit over more than a quarter of a century. It is the dulness of "linguistics" that has given comparative philology a bad name. Set one of those dull books—and they are dull,

"all but unreadable" (I quote myself)—beside Ernout's fascinating story of *adolēre*, a compound of *olē-* "set on flame," misunderstood and confounded with the intransitive ingressive of *alo* "nourish" (not ingressive), viz. *adolescere*, to which it then served as a causative, whence next *abolēre*, *abolēscere* were created—all this proved historically, step by step, by quotations with the words in their contexts—and it is easy to see what language loses when divorced from literature. Read Ernout's pages, and it is as easy to see what the study of literature loses without the sharp and powerful weapon of historical and comparative grammar. I have given only one sample from these enthralling and stimulating studies, each more exciting than the last. Another would be the account of *senex*, an affective form, "Little Old Boy," also a sheer delight to read.

Not that I agree altogether. Can *ferae pecudes* be *asyndeton* at Luer. i. 14 (15)? It is tempting, and the argument persuasive. But what would *ferae* be doing in *pabula laeta*? No, notwithstanding M. Ernout's captivating style and force of logic, *ferae* must go with *inde*. The *pecudes*, tame and domesticated, are changed, *percusae* (*Veneris*) *ui* and are *inde ferae* "then like beasts of the wild"—*ferae* is not predicative but appositional: "then, even as wild beasts, the dumb cattle leap and swim" is the idea. And I think M. Ernout misses the *noble* quality of the wild beast often implicit in *ferus*. In the matter of text and exegesis, meaning is, in the end, paramount over both grammar and punctuation. Nor am I yet quite convinced about *augur*. At least the speaker of Latin must have felt *auis* somehow implicated, in view of *auspex*, *auceps*, *aucupari*, if not of *autumari*. Note *fur*: *fero*—not, I know, enough, because of the difficulty in quantity, but to be reckoned with. If not all "augury" was ornithological, neither was every kind of "auspice." The real trouble with *augur*: *augustus* is the development of meaning. It is all very well to compare *ōjas* with *augus-tus*; there the meaning is plain to see. In *augur* just where is the notion of "greatness"? Many an inaugural is a poor beginning. In a chain of semantic development the links must be not

merely possible in themselves but plausible also in what we know about the extra-linguistic environment of the people using a certain word and also of their language as a whole. Hence *auspex* tends to support the association with *auis*—evidently not to prove the origin of *augur*, which may not be Latin at all. To take a leaf from M. Ernout's book, I may appeal finally to Umbrian *avieklo-* “auguralis,” rather than “*auspicatus*,” which is Umb. *aviekato-* (*Marrue. aviato-*), all from *auī-* “bird,” while Umb. *auie* means “*augurio*,” i.e., “in *auspiciis*.” Again we must appeal to the meaning, which etymology must obey just as much as grammar and punctuation are asked to do.

Three small matters. First, on page 100 the meaning “*cru, non cuit*” can hardly be said to be grafted (“*greffé*”) on the Latin *crudus*. It is ancient, as witness English *raw*. And is *crudus* not for *\*crurus* (*Skt. krurd-*?) Breton *kriz*, Old Irish *crauid*, may, despite all denials, quite well be borrowed from Latin. Second, among M. Ernout's list of Etruscan items in the Latin vocabulary, *trossulus*, used by Persius, himself of Etruscan origin, “*grandee*” (quasi *(\*e)tros-*  
*(\*e)tors-?*), is perhaps lit. “young Etruscan [sc. aristocrat],” much as people say, or used to say, “a grand Turk.” As for a genitive absolute in Latin (p. 193), cf. *CP*, XL (1945), 108–14. It is a misfortune that the book has no *index uerborum*.

One parting shot at the teacher of Latin who thinks ill of historical grammar—read Ernout before some youngster again asks the difference between the perfect of *cerno* and the perfect of *cresco*. The Latin *y*-perfect needs a history of its own. So perhaps we may not blame M. Ernout for reprinting his own papers as the inaugural volume of a new series of “*Etudes et commentaires*” to celebrate the centennial of the *Revue de philologie*, which he directs. However, the *Revue* first appeared in 1877. It is sheer misrepresentation to claim the abortive *Revue de philologie* that ran only two years (1845–47) as being a hundred years old. A lapse of thirty years is nearly a third of the century.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

*Post-Aristophanic Comedy: Studies in the Social Outlook of Middle and New Comedy at Both Athens and Rome.* By PAUL SHANER DUNKIN. (“Illinois Studies in Language and Literature,” Vol. XXXI, Nos. 3–4.) Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1946. Pp. 192. \$2.50; cloth, \$3.00.

It is to be expected that any type of drama that pleases its audience will reflect their social outlook. Furthermore, audiences like to see the characters of whom they approve succeed and to see other characters ridiculed, reformed, or punished. On the other hand, the fact that no one has to live with stage characters makes it easier to tolerate eccentricities and to applaud reckless generosity in the theater than in real life. The present study takes account of Menander, Plautus, and Terence, of four Greek writers known only by fragments, and of other scattered fragments. The author “is convinced that the only really meritorious social outlook is that of the socially useful man; that is, the man whose activities tend to promote the welfare of human society as a whole.” He asks of the poets of Middle and New Comedy: “Whose bread did they eat? Whose song did they sing?” Since Menander is described as “an Athenian gentleman of leisure; handsome, wealthy, aristocratic,” the obvious answer is that he did not write for bread. He so seldom won the prize of victory that it also seems clear that he was writing at least partly to please himself rather than to please his audience at all costs.

There are a number of literary points that must be determined before the social outlook of an author can be discussed profitably. One must know from other writers what actual conditions were and how they were normally viewed by others. In a writer of comedy one must distinguish between the views of characters who are ridiculed or punished and the views that are held up as proper standards for good men. It is only the ideals of ideal characters that should be supposed to indicate the ideals of the author.

The present work is so loose in its logic and so inaccurate in its appreciation of Menander, so incoherent and arbitrary in its judgments,

that the author's command of the tools of scholarship is of no avail. He cheerfully assumes that Menander always gives the man of property the best of it, though it is obvious that Smicrines in the *Epitrepones* is condemned as arbitrary and narrow in his attitude to others. When he rails at slaves who argue eases dressed in goatskins, that makes him oligarchical, like Theognis, whom he paraphrases (54 f.). His daughter protests that he treats her like a slave. He vigorously berates and mauls old Sophrone before Onesimus assails him with a deserved lesson in philosophy. Again the dictum, "Excitement is barred by philosophy," goes counter to the evidence of the *Epitrepones*, where Charisius is a student of philosophy but is thoroughly excited during the whole of his brief scene on the stage. As for the statement that "the slave can play only a minor role," anyone who stages the *Epitrepones* will find that there are five parts for slaves and that they are not less important than those of other characters. Slaves are neither all crafty nor all stupid. When complaint is made that "nothing at all is done to portray Abrotoron as a victim of economic necessity," the author ignores the legal compulsion of slavery, which is surely clear enough and worse for the victim. Chrysis in the *Samia* is not in any sense a courtesan but an honest concubine. Of course, she might have to earn her living as a hetaera if she lost her place by misconduct, but there is no implication in Menander that those who paid for her services would be any less rich than Demeas. They would merely treat her with less respect. Glycera in the *Periceiromene* is in Polemon's eyes a wife, in Moschion's a hetaera, but legally a concubine. Morally she is an honest woman. To call her a "Pseudo-Courtesan" is to revel in confusion.

Menander's attitudes are discussed under the heads of "Invective," "Mythology," and "Philosophy." The statement that "Mythology is respectfully, sometimes beautifully treated" in Menander is as wrong as anything could be. "Invective" seems to mean any reference to contemporary men or events, "Philosophy" any generalization about life, expediency, or duty. No effort is made to show

the relevance of such invective to Menander's social outlook. As for the discussion of fragments, the author is aware that no certain conclusion can be drawn from such materials. He gets better results when he applies his method to the less subtle Latin poets. He finds in Plautus "the instinctive reaction of a vigorous poor man to an oppressive capitalistic system." At least, the system was not so oppressive as to rule out comedy. Terence is excoriated as an obsequious flatterer of the wealthy.

This book contains many general statements that provoke disagreement or questioning. "The sense of humor is what the man who cannot do develops as a defense mechanism when he fails in actual life." Has Illinois so far forgotten her Lincoln? "For philosophy of any kind or even poking fun at philosophy, presupposes on the part of those who cherish it an awareness of overwhelming failure." Say, rather, an awareness of intellectual interests. "Pericles and Aristophanes knew nothing of the doctrines of Adam Smith or Karl Marx, but whatever is true in either economist's theories is just as applicable to the fifth century before Christ as it is to the twentieth century after." How does one apply a theory, however true, to a past situation? In one place the "brilliant plots" of New Comedy are mentioned; in another a play "moves drearily." Such inconsistency is pretty frequent.

Except for some vigorous notes by W. A. Oldfather, there is little that will aid or inspire a classical scholar. Much old material is, however, discussed in an unusual way. The author should not be surprised to learn that one critic at least concludes that his book is no contribution to the welfare of human society as a whole. To glorify action without thought is to cut off the limb that we are all sitting on.

L. A. POST

Haverford College

---

*Cicero's Fight for the Republic: The Historical Background of Cicero's Philippics.* By HARTVIG FRISCH. Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1946. Pp. 311. Kr. 25.

This is the first of a series of translations of the works of Danish classical scholars which will be issued under the general name of

"Humanitas." Other volumes announced to be in preparation are Hartvig Frisch, *Might and Right in Antiquity*, and Carsten Høeg, *Introduction to Cicero*.

The series has started most auspiciously. The author is no armchair classical philologist. His studies led him to Italy in 1920-21, where he witnessed the dissensions of that land which brought Mussolini to power. From 1926 he has been a member of the Rigsdag, serving as chairman of the Social Democratic Parliamentary Group from 1935 to 1940. In a pamphlet published in 1933 he warned the Scandinavian peoples of the menace to Europe in fascism and nazism. Retired by the Germans to private life upon their seizure of Denmark, he re-entered public life at the end of the war and was a delegate of the Rigsdag to the San Francisco conference of 1945. He has, therefore, the experience of a man in the arena of politics to aid him in interpreting a period in which the accumulated political issues of some seventy-five years came to a head.

The book grew out of a series of lectures on the historical background of Cicero's *Philippics* which the author delivered at the University of Copenhagen and is a detailed study of Roman politics and the political activities of Cicero from the assassination of Caesar to the death of Cicero. At the appropriate place in the chronological account there is a brief summary of each *Philippic*. In defense of another presentation of this brief period in Roman history the author states (p. 7): "Now that we have gained new experiences, have seen all the blessings of liberty subverted which in the 19th century were acknowledged as matters of course, even by Reaction, it is natural that the judgment of Cicero, the republican and parliamentarian, the philosopher and publicist, should be made the subject of a renewed examination." He wishes to present "the historical raw material" for the reader to draw his own verdict. This the author has done admirably. The characters of Antony and Cicero are viewed most objectively, and the weaknesses of the latter are not glossed over; indeed, he is psychoanalyzed as a "manio-depressive" (p. 15). On the failure of Cicero to commit suicide when his death was certain, Frisch writes:

"The man of action, when all ways out seem barred, may take the matter-of-fact and unimaginative determination to end the race himself. But the dialectician will never be at a loss for reasons which may postpone the decision, and the consequence is a constant vacillation of his opinions" (p. 303).

Justice is done to all the commanding figures of those two fateful years, and Professor Frisch's evaluation of the issues at stake will be difficult to question. The author's style is clear and vigorous. Several excellent plates add to the beauty of the volume, which unfortunately has a number of typographical errors; and at times the English betrays the fact that it is translation. The straightforward account will hold the interest of the man who "likes to read history," and the many notes and independent approach make the work a "must" for every student of ancient history.

C. H. OLDFATHER

*University of Nebraska*

*Virgilio Eneide, libro quarto.* Edited by ETTORE PARATORE. ("Convivium: Collana di autori greci e latini," Vol. IV.) Rome: Casa editrice Gismondi, 1947. Pp. xlvi+167. L. 280.

The *Fourth Aeneid* continues to fascinate students and scholars, as is witnessed by recent separate editions by Buscaroli (1932), the reviewer (1935), Del Grande (1936), and the present work. If we judge by American standards, it is a little hard to determine at what class of users Paratore aims, since the good and up-to-date bibliography (pp. xlv-xlvii) is rather ambitious for the needs of elementary students, yet the lack of an *apparatus criticus* disappoints the scholarly reader. To be sure, the lack of an *apparatus* is, in part, offset by occasional selective references in the exegetical notes to textual difficulties; and on line 651 the editor remarks that, since the best manuscripts derive from one firmly established ancient tradition, we are not compelled, in cases of variation, to hold consistently to one rather than to the other of the two best codices, M and P. Again, the notes are much fuller in extent—the text averaging less than five lines to a page—

than would be demanded by beginners, yet some of the observations seem unduly elementary for advanced students.

The Introduction deals, first, with the sources and the legend, and Paratore rightly feels that, though Virgil may have borrowed from Naevius, he got little of psychological importance for Dido's character from that source. Though the influence of Cleopatra upon the description of Dido is discussed, the editor underestimates it and hardly presents it in its full force. On the other hand, in Introduction and notes he is much concerned with the order of composition of the books of the *Aeneid* and its possible effect in causing inconsistencies of treatment. When, on page xx, he inquires why Books ii, iv, and vi were read to Augustus as a foretaste of the whole work, he seems to overlook the fact that these three books are a natural selection as being not only highly interesting and important to the work as a whole but also the units which, when extracted from the whole poem, would be most intelligible in themselves.

Among notorious textual *cruces* Paratore reads (l. 9) *insomnia torrent;* (l. 436) *quam mihi cum dederit, cumulatam morte remittam;* (l. 541) *inrisam;* and (l. 645) *gradus.* Summaries introduced for the different portions of the notes contain observations of interest; e.g., that on lines 630-705 may be especially commended. Ennian and other sources are often cited in the notes, though seldom *in extenso* (and Greek sources almost never so), but the student would gain from the notes little conception of the wide sweep of Virgilian influence upon later literature. It would seem also that inadequate explanation is given of the magical passage in lines 504-21. On the other hand, the editor has a keen ear for alliteration, *enjambement*, and word order in general. As a whole the notes, though in large measure derived from others, such as Buscaroli, Del Grande, Rostagni, and my own edition, are always sensible, in good taste, and occasionally (as on l. 679) very penetrating. Misprints are few; for the cheap quality of the paper the editor deserves sympathy rather than blame.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

Harvard University

*Compositiones Lucenses.* By J. SVENNUNG. ("Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift," 1941, Fasec. 5.) Uppsala: Lundequistka Bokhandeln, 1941. Pp. x+204. Kr. 6.

This is a study of the text first edited by Muratori in *Antiquitates Italicae medii aevi*, Vol. II (Milan, 1739), Dissert. 24, cols. 365-88, under the title *Compositiones ad tingenda musiva, palles et alia, etc.* It is a collection of instructions with regard to metalwork—gold, silver, bronze, lead, and other metals—the use of purple, the art of gilding, the manufacture and staining of glass, and so on. And there are notes on the origin and incidence of various kinds of stone and of minerals and dyes.

The text is in a fragmentary state. It derives ultimately from Alexandrian Greek originals and is preserved only in the famous Codex 490 of the Cathedral library in Lucca, which was written ca. 800. It may date from the seventh or early eighth century. A modern edition by Hj. Hedfors appeared in 1932.

The author has investigated the tradition of the text and its relation to other similar treatises. He has edited a hitherto unpublished fragment. The major part of his work consists of a chapter devoted to textual criticism and discussion of the contents of the *Compositiones* and a chapter on the language.

Students of the history of medieval art will find much of interest in the former chapter, and Romance philologists cannot afford to neglect the latter. The text is marked by a high degree of vulgarism, but the influence of the literary language is seen at many points. The genitive and dative cases survive. Only occasionally is the genitive replaced by a *dē* construction. The fifth declension is preserved. The periphrasis with *habēre* to express future or perfect is rare. But the future in *-bo* has been lost (only one example), and present and future are falling together. The pronoun *is*, which has disappeared in Romance, still occurs; and the comparison of adjectives has not given way to the use of *magis* or *plus*, save for a few instances of *plus*.

The last chapter is devoted to a useful discussion of the term *mosaic*.

Mr. Svennung is to be congratulated on a well-ordered and informative study.

M. DILLON

*University of Edinburgh*

*Numismatic Literature*, No. 1 (October, 1947).

Edited by SAWYER MCA. MOSSER. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1947. Pp. 32. To be published quarterly. \$1.00 a year; 35 cents a copy.

This periodical is designed to continue the work of the *Numismatisches Litteratur-Blatt*, which died in 1939. Any periodical devoted to bibliography is bound to be welcome, and this one has great promise. Its editor, as librarian of the Numismatic Society, is probably in a better position to carry out this work than anyone else in the United States, and the introductory statement of tentative plans suggests that it will be thorough and well organized. There will be (a) descriptive lists of books; (b) similar lists of periodicals and numismatic articles; (c) an index of reviews; (d) an index of dealers' catalogues; and (e) a calendar of important events in numismatics.

The first issue does not attempt all these things. It contains little beyond lists, with occasional very brief comments, of publications during the years 1940-45. These appear under the following heads: "General"; "Ancient"; "Greek"; "Roman"; "Byzantine"; "Visigothic"; "Medieval and Modern"; "Islamic"; "Indian"; "Far East"; "United States"; "Latin American"; "Medals"; "Tokens and Jetons"; "Paper Money"; "Mint Reports"; and "Periodicals." This is valuable enough by itself and appears to have been done with great care and industry. One can hardly expect more in the first issue, and the editor and the society deserve the warm appreciation of all scholars interested in numismatics. If the plans outlined at the beginning are carried out, *Numismatic Literature* will be

a model for similar and greatly needed work in other fields of scholarship.

LAURENCE LEE HOWE

*University of Louisville*

*Coins of Tingi with Latin Legends*. By ALINE ABAECHERLI BOYCE. ("Numismatic Notes and Monographs," No. 109.) New York: American Numismatic Society, 1947. Pp. 27+5 pls. No price stated.

The local coinage struck by the cities and provinces of the Roman Empire has never been adequately published. Any contribution to this field of numismatics, therefore, is always welcome, and especially when it is done by a thoroughly competent scholar in whose work we may place confidence. The field covered by this monograph is narrow and highly technical, and its bearing on general history is not immediately evident. These factors make it difficult to review in a periodical not primarily devoted to pure numismatics. Perhaps the only thing that will strike the attention of the general historian is the persistence of Punic legends on the coins of Tingi under Augustus (p. 6).

The recent publication of Michael Grant's impressive general study of the coinage of this era,<sup>1</sup> however, shows the significance that such spadework has for Roman history, once it has been put together into an integrated whole. It is a pity that Grant's work came out while that of Mrs. Boyce was in press (see pp. 25-27), and it was apparently too late for her to do more than add a brief note mentioning some differences in dating between her and Grant. This, however, detracts very little from the value of her study.

LAURENCE LEE HOWE

*University of Louisville*

<sup>1</sup> From *Imperium to Auctoritas: A Historical Study of Aes Coinage in the Roman Empire, 49 B.C.-A.D. 14* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1946).

## BOOKS RECEIVED

[Not all works submitted can be reviewed, but those that are sent to the editorial office for notice are regularly listed under "Books Received." Offprints from periodicals and parts of books will not be listed unless they are published (sold) separately. Books submitted are not returnable.]

ALBENQUE, ALEXANDRE. *Inventaire de l'archéologie gallo-romaine du département de l'Aveyron*. Rodez: P. Carrère, 1947. Pp. 204. Fr. 390.

*Archivum philologicum: Egyetemes philologai közlöny*, Vols. LXIX (1946) and LXX (1947).

BARNHART, CLARENCE L. (ed.). *The American College Dictionary*. Text ed. New York: Harper & Bros., 1948. Pp. xi+1432. \$5.00; with Index, \$6.00.

BEAZLEY, J. D. *Etruscan Vase-painting*. ("Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology," ed. J. D. BEAZLEY and PAUL JACOBSTHAL, Vol. I.) Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1947. Pp. xvi+351+40 pls. \$25.00.

BERRY, VIRGINIA GINGERICK (ed. and trans.). *Odo de Deuil, "De profectione Ludovici VII in orientem."* Edited, with an English translation. ("Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies," ed. AUSTIN P. EVANS, No. 42.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1948. Pp. xliv+154. \$3.25.

BŁIŃSKI, BRONISLAW. *De Apollodoreis in Pliniana Graeciae descriptione (N.H. IV 1-32) obvias*. ("Travaux de la Société des sciences et des lettres de Wrocław," Ser. A, No. 7.) Breslau: J. Lach, 1948. Pp. 135.

—. "Les Voies du monde antique vers les terres slaves à la lumière des témoignages littéraires de l'antiquité" (Polish; French summary). (*Archeologia*, No. I.) Breslau, 1947. Pp. 35.

BLAKE, MARION ELIZABETH. *Ancient Roman Construction in Italy from the Prehistoric Period to Augustus: A Chronological Study Based in Part upon the Material Accumulated by the Late Dr. Esther Boise Van Deman*. ("Carnegie Institution of Washington Publications," No. 570.) Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution, 1947. Pp. xxiv+421+57 pls. \$9.00; cloth, \$10.00.

*Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo*, Vol. III (1947). Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo, 1947.

CLARK, DONALD LEMEN. *John Milton at St. Paul's School: A Study of Ancient Rhetoric in*

*English Renaissance Education*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1948. Pp. xii+269. \$3.50.

DELATTE, ARMAND (ed.). *Les Portulans grecs*. ("Bibliothèque de la Faculté de philosophie et lettres de l'Université de Liège," No. 107.) Liège: Faculté de philosophie et lettres; Paris: E. Droz, 1947. Pp. xxiv+400. Fr. 250.

DELATTE, LOUIS (ed.). *Textes latins et vieux français relatifs aux Cyranides*. ("Bibliothèque de la Faculté de philosophie et lettres de l'Université de Liège," No. 93.) Liège: Faculté de philosophie et lettres; Paris: E. Droz, 1942. Pp. x+354. Fr. 100.

—. *Les Traîts de la royauté d'Ephante, Diogène et Sthénidas*. ("Bibliothèque de la Faculté de philosophie et lettres de l'Université de Liège," No. 97.) Liège: Faculté de philosophie et lettres; Paris: E. Droz, 1942. Pp. x+318. Fr. 100.

DE LORENZI, ATTILIO. *Quaderni filologici*, No. II: "Dimidiatus Menander" alla luce della polemica antiatticista di Cicerone. Naples, 1948. Pp. 51. L. 400. Order from the author, Via Edgardo Cortese (pal. Lamaro), Naples.

DES PLACES, ÉDOUARD. *Le Pronom chez Pindare: Recherches philologiques et critiques*. ("Études et commentaires," No. 3.) Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1947. Pp. vi+114.

DIERCKS, GERARDUS [FREDERIK. Q. Septimius Florens Tertullianus "De oratione": Critische Uitgave met Prolegomena, Vertaling en philologisch-exegetisch-liturgische Commentaar. (Dissertation, Amsterdam, 1947.) Bussum: Uitgeverij Paul Brand, 1947. Pp. civ+312. Fl. 11.50.

HERTER, HANS. *Vom dionysischen Tanz zum komischen Spiel: Die Anfänge der attischen Komödie*. ("Darstellung und Deutung: Vorträge und Schriften aus den Geisteswissenschaften und ihren Grenzgebieten," Heft 1.) Iserlohn: Silva-Verlag, 1947. Pp. 59.

"Τρούγειον θρησκευμάτων καὶ ἔθνικῆς παιδείας: Διεύθυνσις ἀρχαιοτήτων καὶ ιστορικῶν μνημείων. Ζημίαι τῶν ἀρχαιοτήτων ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου καὶ τῶν στρατῶν κατοχῆς.

'Αθῆναι : ἐκ τοῦ έθνικοῦ τυπογραφείου, 1946. Pp. 160.

KRAAK, WILLEM KAREL. *Vogeltrek in de Oudheid, in het bijzonder bij Aristoteles*. (Dissertation, Leiden, 1940.) Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1940. Pp. 114.

LONG, HERBERT STRAINGE. *A Study of the Doctrine of Metempsychosis in Greece from Pythagoras to Plato*. (Dissertation, Princeton, 1942.) Princeton, N.J., 1948. Pp. x+93. Copies of this dissertation may be obtained, for \$1.25 each, by addressing the author at Dexter, N.Y.

NEWMARK, MAXIM (ed.). *Twentieth Century Modern Language Teaching: Sources and Readings*. With an Introduction by NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER. New York: Philosophical Library, 1948. Pp. xxii+723. \$7.50.

PAAP, A. H. R. E. *De Herodoti reliquiis in papyris et membranis Aegyptiis servatis*. ("Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava," Vol. IV.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1948. Pp. viii+101. 20 guilders.

PIGHI, IOANNES BAPTISTA (ed.). *Ammiani Marcellini rerum gestarum capita selecta*. ("Bibliotheca Neocomensis," ed. M. NIEDERMANN, No. 2.) Neuchâtel: Éditions du Griffon; Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1948. Pp. xxx+74. Swiss fr. 8.70.

VAN DER PLOEG, LEENDERT. *Theramenes en zijn Tijd*. (Dissertation, Utrecht, 1948.) Utrecht: Kemink & Zoon, 1948. Pp. viii+278.

ROBINSON, C. E. *Hellas: A Short History of Ancient Greece*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1948. Pp. 201. \$3.00.

ROSE, H. J. *Aeneas pontifex*. ("Vergilian Essays," No. 2.) London: Phoenix Press, 1948. Pp. 28. 1s. 6d.

SAINT-DENIS, E. DE. *Le Vocabulaire des animaux marins en latin classique*. ("Études et commentaires," No. 2.) Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1947. Pp. xxxii+120. Fr. 300.

SCHEFOLD, KARL. *Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker*. Basel: Benno Schwabe & Co., Verlag, 1943. Pp. 228. Swiss fr. 32. Order from Albert J. Phiebig, Suite 906, 545 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.

SHERLOCK, RICHARD B. *The Syntax of the Nominal Forms of the Verb, Exclusive of the Participle, in St. Hilary*. ("Catholic University of America Patristic Studies," Vol. LXXVI.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1947. Pp. xx+365.

THOMSON, J. A. K. *The Classical Background of English Literature*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1948. Pp. 272. \$3.50.

WASZINK, J. H. (ed.). *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani "De anima."* Edited with Introduction and Commentary. Amsterdam: J. M. Meulenhoff, 1947. Pp. xii+700. Fl. 40.

WEGENER, E. P. (ed.). *Some Oxford Papyri (P. Oxford): Plates*. ("Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava," Vol. IIIB.) Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1948. Pp. viii+18 pls.

"An-  
books,  
ays,"

maux  
com-  
e C.  
00.

utiken  
Enno  
Swiss  
Suite  
N.Y.  
minal  
ole, in  
merica  
ington,  
Press,

and of  
n Co.,

rentis  
roduc-  
J. M.

ri (P.  
duno-  
1948.